



UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01653337 2





T. and T. Clark's Publications.

New and Cheaper Edition of Lange's
Life of Christ.

Now complete, in Four Volumes, demy 8vo, price 28s. (Subscription price),

THE LIFE OF THE LORD
JESUS CHRIST :

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN,
CONTENTS, AND CONNECTION OF THE GOSPELS.

Translated from the German of

J. P. LANGE, D. D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.


EDITED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,

BY THE REV. MARCUS DODS, M.A.

*** This valuable Work has been out of print for some time, but has been much in demand. The Six Volumes now occupy Four; and whilst the whole matter is retained, it is published at a little cheaper price.*

Extract from Editor's Preface.

'The work of Dr. Lange, translated in the accompanying volumes, holds among books the honourable position of being the most complete Life of our Lord. There are other works which more thoroughly investigate the authenticity of the Gospel records, some which more satisfactorily discuss the chronological difficulties involved in this most important of histories, and some which present a more formal and elaborate exegetical treatment of the sources; but there is no single work in which all these branches are so fully attended to, or in which so much matter bearing on the main subject is brought together, or in which so many points are elucidated. The immediate object of this comprehensive and masterly work was to refute those views of the life of our Lord which had been propagated by Negative Criticism, and to substitute that authentic and consistent history which a truly scientific and enlightened criticism educes from the Gospels.



LANGE'S
COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

MESSRS. CLARK have now pleasure in intimating their arrangements, under the Editorship of Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF, for the Publication of Translations of the Commentaries of Dr. LANGE and his *Collaborateurs*, on the Old and New Testaments.

Of the OLD TESTAMENT, they have published the

COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF GENESIS, One Volume, imperial 8vo, to which is prefixed a Theological and Homiletical Introduction to the Old Testament, and a Special Introduction to Genesis, by Professor TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., comprising Excursus on all the chief subjects of Controversy.

COMMENTARY ON PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, AND THE SONG OF SOLOMON, in One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS, in One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH, in One Volume.

Other Volumes on the Old Testament are in active preparation, and will be announced as soon as ready.

Messrs. CLARK have already published in the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY the Commentaries on St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and the Acts of the Apostles.

They had resolved to issue that on St. John only in the imperial 8vo form; but at the request of many of their Subscribers they will publish it (without Dr. Schaff's Additions) in Two Volumes, demy 8vo, uniform with the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, which will be supplied to Subscribers at 10s. 6d.

There are now ready (in imperial 8vo, double column),

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN, in One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE GALATIANS, EPHESIANS, PHILIPPIANS, and COLOSSIANS. In One Volume.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS, TIMOTHY, TITUS, PHILEMON, and HEBREWS. In One Vol.

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, PETER, JOHN, and JUDE. In One Volume.

The New Testament is thus complete, with the exception of the Commentary on the Book of Revelation, which is in progress.

The Commentaries on Matthew, in one vol.; Mark and Luke, in one vol.; and on Acts, in one vol., may be had uniform with the above if desired.

Each of the above volumes (four on Old Testament and five on Epistles) will be supplied to Subscribers to the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY and ANTE-NICENE LIBRARY, or to Purchasers of complete sets of Old Testament (so far as published), and of Epistles, at 15s. The price to others will be 21s. each volume.

THE WORKS

OF

TRANSFERRED

AURELIUS AUGUSTINE,

BISHOP OF HIPPO.

W. Berigan

A NEW TRANSLATION.

Edited by the

REV. MARCUS DODS, M.A.

VOL. IV.


THE ANTI-PELAGIAN WORKS OF SAINT AUGUSTINE.

VOLUME I.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET

MDCCLXXII.





SEP 19 1949

PRINTED BY MURRAY AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

NEW YORK, C. SCRIBNER AND CO.

THE
ANTI-PELAGIAN WORKS
OF
SAINT AUGUSTINE,
BISHOP OF HIPPO.

Translated by

PETER HOLMES, D.D., F.R.A.S.,

DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HON. THE COUNTESS OF ROTHES;
AND CURATE OF PENNYCROSS, PLYMOUTH.

VOLUME I.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

MDCCCLXXII.

1872



DEDICATION.

—◆—
TO THE RIGHT REVEREND
THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY DEAR LORD,

I gladly avail myself of your permission to dedicate this volume to you. In the course of a professional life of nearly the third of a century, which has not been idly spent, I have never failed to find pleasure in theological pursuits. In the intervals of most pressing labour, these have often tended to refresh and comfort one's wearied spirit. If this confession of my own experience should have any weight with any one in our sacred calling to combine the hard work which we owe to others while ministering to their wants, with "that diligent attendance to reading" which we require for ourselves, to inform our minds and refresh our spirits, I shall have accomplished my only purpose in making it. Your Lordship, I am sure, will entirely approve of such a combination of employments in your clergy. I well remember your recommendation of theological study to us at the opening of Bishop Phillpott's Library at Truro; and how you counselled us the more earnestly to pursue it, from the danger there is, in these busy times, of merging the acquisition of sacred learning in the active labours of our holy vocation. That the divine blessing may crown the work which you are so diligently prosecuting in the several functions of your high office, is the earnest wish, my dear Lord, of your faithful servant,

PETER HOLMES.

MANNAMEAD, PLYMOUTH,
March 10, 1872.

PREFACE.

CONTENTS.—§ 1. *The Latin titles of the treatises contained in this volume ; on the Preface of the Benedictine Edition.* § 2. *Notice of Pelagius and his opinions.* § 3. *Of Cælestius and his doctrine, in seven propositions.* § 4. *On Augustine as compared with other doctors of the Church ; his estimate of Pelagius and Cælestius.* § 5. *The different fortunes of these two men at first.* § 6. *St. Jerome differs from St. Augustine as to the origin of Pelagianism ; East and West, their doctrinal characteristics—how agreeing, how varying.* § 7. *On the conduct of Augustine and Pelagius ; partisanship of their followers and critics.* § 8. *Paramount influence of St. Augustine in ancient and modern times, and in various parts of Christendom.* § 9. *Reason of this influence ; Augustine true to Scripture and human experience ; in favourable contrast to Pelagius as to the scientific depth and accuracy of his doctrine.* § 10. *Rationalism and Revelation ; Pelagius' views isolated and incoherent ; Augustine an excellent guide in Scripture knowledge.* § 11. *Popularity and permanence of Pelagianism ; consentient with man's natural feelings ; elevating influence of Divine Grace, its ultimate triumph in everlasting glory.* § 12. *Original text from which this translation is made ; works useful in the Pelagian controversy.*

§ 1. **T**HE reader has in this volume, translated for the first time in English, five of the fifteen treatises of St. Augustine on the Pelagian heresy. They are here arranged in the same order (the chronological one) in which they are placed in the tenth volume of the Benedictine edition, and are therefore St. Augustine's earliest contributions to the great controversy. These are their Latin titles :

De peccatorum meritis et remissione, et de baptismo parvulorum ad Marcellinum ; libri tres, scripti anno Christi 412.

De Spiritu et littera ad eundem ; liber unus, scriptus sub finem anni 412.

De natura et gratia contra Pelagium, ad Timasium et Jacobum ; liber unus, scriptus anno Christi 415.

De perfectione justitiæ hominis; [Epistola seu] liber ad Eutropium et Paulum, scriptus circiter finem anni 415.
De gestis Pelagii ad Aurelium episcopum; liber unus, scriptus sub initium anni 417.

The Benedictine editors have enriched their edition with prefaces ("Admonitiones") and critical and explanatory notes, and, above all, with the appropriate extracts from St. Augustine's *Retractations*,¹ in which we have the author's own final revision and correction of his works. All these have been reproduced in a translated form in this volume; and they will, it is believed, afford the reader sufficient guidance for an intelligent apprehension of at least the special arguments of the several treatises. The Benedictine editors, however, prefixed to this detailed information an elaborate and lengthy preface, in which they reviewed the general history of the Pelagian discussions and their authors, with especial reference to the part which St. Augustine played throughout it. This historical introduction it was at first intended to present to the reader in English at the head of this volume. In consideration, however, of the length of the document, we have so far changed our purpose as to substitute a shorter statement of certain facts and features of the Pelagian controversy, which it is hoped may contribute to a better understanding of the general subject.

§ 2. The Pelagian heresy is so designated after Pelagius, a British monk. (Augustine calls him *Brito*, so do Prosper and Gennadius; by Orosius he is called *Britannicus noster*, and by Mercator described as *gente Britannus*. This wide epithet is somewhat restricted by Jerome, who says of him, *Habet progeniem Scotiæ gentis de Britannorum vicinia*; leaving it uncertain, however, whether he deemed Scotland his native country, or Ireland. His monastic character is often referred to both by Augustine and other writers, and Pope Zosimus describes him as *Laicum virum ad bonam frugem longa erga Deum servitute nitentem*. It is, after all, quite uncertain what part of "Britain" gave him birth; among other conjectures, he has

¹ It is satisfactory to observe how brief and scanty are his "Retractations" on the topics treated in the present volume.

been made a native of Wales, attached to a monastery at Bangor, and gifted with the Welsh name of *Morgan*, of which his usual designation of *Pelagius* is supposed to be simply the Greek version, *Πελαγίος*.) It was at the beginning of the fifth century that he became conspicuous. He then resided at Rome, known by many as an honourable and earnest man, seeking in a corrupt age to reform the morals of society. (In the present volume the reader will not fail to observe the eulogistic language which Augustine often uses of Pelagius; see pages 98, 132, 134, 409.) Sundry theological treatises are even attributed to him; among them one *On the Trinity*, of unquestionable orthodoxy, and showing great ability. Unfavourable reports, however, afterwards began to be circulated, charging him with opening, in fact, entirely new ground in the fields of heresy. During the previous centuries of Christian opinion the speculations of active thinkers had been occupied on *Theology* properly so called, or the doctrine of God as to His nature and personal attributes, including *Christology*, which treated of Christ's divine and human natures. This was objective divinity. With Pelagius, however, a fresh class of subjects was forced on men's attention: in his peculiar system of doctrine he deals with what is subjective in man, and reviews the whole of his relation to God. His heresy turns mainly upon two points—the assumed incorruptness of human nature, and the denial of all supernatural influence upon the human will.

§ 3. He had an early associate in Cœlestius, a native of Campania, according to some, or as others say, of Ireland or of Scotland. This man, who is said to have been highly connected, began life as an advocate, but, influenced by the advice and example of Pelagius, soon became a monk. He excelled his master in boldness and energy; and thus early precipitated the new doctrine into a formal dogmatism, from which the caution and subtler management of Pelagius might have saved it. In the year A.D. 412 (Pelagius having just left him at Carthage to go to Palestine), Cœlestius was accused before the bishop Aurelius of holding and teaching the following opinions:

1. Adam was created mortal, and must have died, even if

he had not sinned ; 2. Adam's sin injured himself only, and not mankind ; 3. Infants are born in the state of Adam before he fell ; 4. Mankind neither died in Adam, nor rose again in Christ ; 5. The Law, no less than the Gospel, brings men to the kingdom of heaven ; 6. There were sinless men before the coming of Christ.¹ What Cœlestius thus boldly propounded, he had the courage to maintain. On his refusal to retract, he was excommunicated. He threatened, or perhaps actually though ineffectually made, an appeal to Rome, and afterwards quitted Carthage for Ephesus.

§ 4. Augustine, who had for some time been occupied in the Donatist controversy, had as yet taken no personal part in the proceedings against Cœlestius. Soon, however, was his attention directed to the new opinions, and he wrote the first two treatises contained in this volume, in the year when Cœlestius was excommunicated. At first he treated Pelagius, as has been said, with deference and forbearance, hoping by courtesy to recall him from danger. But as the heresy developed, Augustine's opposition was more directly and vigorously exhibited. The gospel was being fatally tampered with, in its essential facts of human sin and divine grace ; so, in the fulness of his own absolute loyalty to the entire volume of evangelical truth, he concentrated his best efforts in opposition to the now formidable heresy. It is perhaps not too much to say, that St. Augustine, the greatest doctor of the Catholic Church, effected his greatness mainly by his labours against Pelagianism. Other Christian writers besides Augustine have achieved results of decisive influence on the Church and its deposit of the Christian faith. St. Athanasius, "alone against the world," has often been referred to as a splendid instance of what constancy, aided by God's grace and a profound knowledge of theology, could accomplish ; St. Cyril of Alexandria, and St. Leo of Rome, might be also quoted as signal proofs of the efficacy of catholic truth in opposition to popular heresy : these men, under God, saved the Creed from the ravages of Arianism, and the subtler injuries of Nestorius and Eutyches. Then, again, in the curious learning of the

¹ Marius Mercator mentions a seventh opinion broached by Cœlestius, to the effect that "infants, though they be unbaptized, have everlasting life."

primitive Irenæus ; in the critical skill, and wide knowledge, and indomitable labours of Origen ; in the catechetical teaching of the elder Cyril ; in the chaste descriptive power of Basil ; in the simplicity and self-denial of Ambrose ; in the fervid eloquence of the "golden-mouthed" Chrysostom ; in the great learning of Jerome ; in the scholastic accuracy of Damascene ; and in the varied sacred gifts of other Christian worthies, from the impetuous Tertullian and the gentle Cyprian, with all the Gregories of manifold endowments, down to the latest period of patristic wisdom, graced by our own Anselm and the unrivalled preacher Bernard,—in all these converging lines of diverse yet compatible accomplishments, the Church of Christ has found, from age to age, ample reinforcements against the attacks of heretical hostility. And in our great Bishop of Hippo one may trace, operating on various occasions in his various works, the manifold characteristics which we have just enumerated of his brother saints,—with this difference, that in no one of them are found combined the many traits which constitute *his* greatness. We have here to do only with his anti-Pelagian writings. Upon the whole, perhaps, these exhibit most of his wonderful resources of Christian character. In many respects, one is reminded by him of the great apostle, whom he revered, and whose profound doctrines he republished and vindicated. He has himself, in several of his works, especially in his *Confessions*, admitted us to a view of the sharp convulsions and bitter conflicts through which he passed, before his regeneration, into the Christian life, animated by the free and sovereign grace of God, and adorned with his unflagging energies in works of faith and love. From the depths of his own consciousness he instinctively felt the dangers of Pelagianism, and he put forth his strength, as God enabled him, to meet the evil ; and the reader has in this volume samples in great variety of the earnestness of his conflict with the new heresy and its leaders. These leaders he has himself characterized : "*Ille* [nempe Cœlestius] *apertior, iste* [scilicet Pelagius] *occultior fuit ; ille pertinacior, iste mendacior ; vel certe ille liberior, hic astutior ;*"¹ and illustrations of the general correctness of this estimate will

¹ *De Peccato originali*, [xii.] 13. In the second volume of this series.

be forthcoming, especially in the fourth treatise of this volume, where Cœlestius is dealt with, and in the fifth, which relates to the subterfuges and pretexts practised by Pelagius in his proceedings in Palestine.

§ 5. The difference in the characters of the two leaders in this heresy contributed to different results in their earlier proceedings. We have seen the disastrous issue to Cœlestius at Carthage, from his outspoken and unyielding conduct. The more reserved Pelagius, resorting to a dexterous management of sundry favourable circumstances, obtained a friendly hearing on two public occasions—at Jerusalem, in the summer of A.D. 415, and again at the end of that year, in a council of fourteen bishops, at Diospolis, the ancient Lydda. In the last treatise of this volume, the reader has a characteristic narrative of these events from St. Augustine's own pen. The holy man's disappointment at the untoward results of these two inquiries is apparent; but he struggles to maintain his respect for the bishops concerned in the affair, and comforts himself and all Catholics with the assurance, which he thinks is warranted by the proceedings, that the acquittal obtained by Pelagius, through the concealment of his real opinions, amounted in fact to a condemnation of them. This volume terminates with these transactions in Palestine; so that any remarks on the decline and fall of Pelagianism proper must be postponed to a subsequent volume.

§ 6. St. Jerome as well as St. Augustine engaged in this controversy, and experienced in the East some loss and much danger from the rougher followers of Pelagius.¹ It is not without interest that one observes the difference of view entertained by these eminent men on the general question of the Pelagian heresy. Augustine had but an imperfect acquaintance with either the language or the writings of the Greek Fathers, and had treated the Pelagian opinions as unheard-of novelties. Jerome, however, who had acquired a competent knowledge of the Christian literature of Greece during his long residence in the East, traced these heretical opinions to the school of Origen, for whose memory he entertained but scant respect. There is, no doubt, extravagance in Jerome's censure, but withal a founda-

¹ See the last page of this volume.

tion of truth. For from the beginning there was a tendency at least to divergent views between the Eastern and the Western sections of Christendom, on the relation of the human will to the grace of God in the matter of man's conversion and salvation. On the general question, indeed, there was always substantial agreement in the Catholic Church;—man, as he is born into the world, is not in his originally perfect state; in order to be able to live according to his original nature and to do good, he requires an inward change by the almighty power of God. But this general agreement did not hinder specific differences of opinion, which having been developed with considerable regularity, in East and West respectively, admit of some classification. The chief writers of the West, especially Tertullian and Cyprian in the third century, and Hilary of Poitiers and (notably) Ambrose in the fourth century, prominently state the doctrine of man's corruption, and the consequent necessity of a change of his nature by divine grace; whilst the Alexandrian Fathers (especially Clement), and other Orientals (for instance, Chrysostom), laid great stress upon human freedom, and on the indispensable co-operation of this freedom with the grace of God. By the fifth century these tendencies were ready to culminate; they were at length precipitated to a decisive controversy. In the Pelagian system, the liberty which had been claimed for man was pushed to the heretical extreme of independence of God's help; while Augustine, in resisting this heresy, found it hard to keep clear of the other extreme, of the absorption of human responsibility into the divine sovereignty. Our author, no doubt, moves about on the confines of a deep insoluble mystery here; but, upon the whole, it must be apparent to the careful reader how earnestly he tries to maintain and vindicate man's responsibility even amidst the endowments of God's grace.

§ 7. Much has been written on the conduct of the two leading opponents in this controversy. Sides (as usual) have been taken, and extreme opinions of praise and of blame have been freely bestowed on both Augustine and Pelagius. It is impossible, even were it desirable, in this limited space to enter upon a question which; after all, hardly rises above the dignity of mere *personalities*. The orthodox bishop and the

heretical monk have had their share of censure as to their mode of conducting the controversy. Augustine has been taxed with intolerance, Pelagius with duplicity. We are perhaps not in a position to form an impartial judgment on the case. To begin with, the evidence comes all from one side; and then the critics pass their sentence according to the suggestions of modern prejudice, rather than by the test of ancient contemporary facts, motives, and principles of action. A good deal of obloquy has been cast on Augustine, as if he were responsible for the Rescript of Honorius and its penalties; but this is (to say the least) a conclusion which outruns the premises. We need say nothing of the peril which seriously threatened true religion when the half-informed bishops of Palestine, and the vacillating Pope, all gave their hasty and ill-grounded approval to Pelagius, as a justification of Augustine. He deeply felt the seriousness of the crisis, and he unsheathed "the sword of the Spirit," and dealt with it trenchant blows, every one of which struck home with admirable precision; but it is not proved that he ever wielded the civil sword of pains and penalties. Of all theological writers in ancient, medieval, or earlier modern times, it may be fairly maintained that St. Augustine has shown himself the most considerate, courteous, and charitable towards opponents. The reader will trace with some interest the progress of his criticism on Pelagius. From the forbearance and love which he gave him at first,¹ he passes slowly and painfully on to censure and condemnation, but only as he detects stronger and stronger proofs of insincerity and bad faith.

§ 8. But whatever estimate we may form on the score of their personal conduct, there can be no doubt of the bishop's

¹ For some time Augustine abstained from mentioning the name of Pelagius, to save him as much as he could from exposure, and to avoid the irritation which might urge him to heresy from obstinacy. Augustine recognised fairly enough the motive which influenced Pelagius at first. The latter dreaded the Antinomianism of the day, and concentrated his teaching in a doctrine which was meant as a protest against it. "We would rather not do injustice to our friends," says Augustine, as he praises their "strong and active minds;" and he goes on to commend Pelagius anonymously for "the zeal which he entertains against those *who find a defence for their sins in the infirmity of human nature.*" See the third treatise of this volume, *On Nature and Grace*, ch. 6, 7.

superiority over the monk, when we come to gauge the value of their principles and doctrines, whether tested by Scripture or by the great facts of human nature. Concerning the test of Scripture, our assertion will be denied by no one. No ancient Christian writer approaches near St. Augustine in his general influence on the opinions and belief of the Catholic Church, in its custody and interpretation of Holy Scripture; and there can be no mistake either as to the Church's uniform guardianship of the Augustinian doctrine, taken as a whole, or as to its invariable resistance to the Pelagian system, whenever and however it has been reproduced in the revolutions of human thought. There cannot be found in all ecclesiastical history a more remarkable fact than the deference shown to the great Bishop of Hippo throughout Christendom, on all points of salient interest connected with his name. Whatever basis of doctrine exists in common between the great sections of Catholicism and Protestantism, was laid at first by the genius and piety of St. Augustine. In the conflicts of the early centuries he was usually the champion of Scripture truth against dangerous errors. In the Middle Ages his influence was paramount with the eminent men who built up the scholastic system. In the modern Latin Church he enjoys greater consideration than either Ambrose, or Hilary, or Jerome, or even Gregory the Great; and lastly, and perhaps most strangely, he stands nearest to evangelical Protestantism, and led the van of the great movement in the sixteenth century, which culminated in the Reformation. How unique the influence which directed the minds of Anselm, and Bernard, and Aquinas, and Bonaventure, with no less power than it swayed the thoughts of Luther, and Melancthon, and Zuingle, and Calvin!

§ 9. The key to this wonderful influence is Augustine's knowledge of Holy Scripture, and its profound suitableness to the facts and experience of our entire nature. Perhaps to no one, not excepting St. Paul himself, has it been ever given so wholly and so deeply to suffer the manifold experiences of the human heart, whether of sorrow and anguish from the tyranny of sin, or of spiritual joy from the precious consolations of the grace of God. Augustine speaks with authority here; he has

traversed all the ground of inspired writ, and shown us how true is its portraiture of man's life. And, to pass on to our last point, he has threaded the mazes of human consciousness; and in building up his doctrinal system, has been, in the main, as true to the philosophy of fact as he is to the statements of revelation. He appears in as favourable a contrast to his opponent in his philosophy as in his Scripture exegesis. We cannot, however, in the limits of this Preface, illustrate this criticism with all the adducible proofs; but we may quote one or two weak points which radically compromise Pelagius as to the scientific bearings of his doctrine. By science we mean accurate knowledge, which stands the test of the widest induction of facts. Now, it has been frequently remarked that Pelagius is scientifically defective in the very centre of his doctrine,—on the freedom of the will. His theory, especially in the hands of his vigorous followers, Cœlestius and Julianus,¹ ignored the influence of habit on human volition, and the development of habits from action, isolating human acts, making man's power of choice (his *liberum arbitrium*) a mere natural faculty, of physical, not moral operation. How defective this view is,—how it impoverishes the moral nature of man, strips it of the very elements of its composition, and drops out of consideration the many facts of human life, which interlace themselves in our experience as the very web and woof of moral virtue,—is manifest to the students of Aristotle and Butler.² Acts are not mere insulated atoms, merely done, and then done with; but they have a relation to the will, and an influence upon subsequent acts: and so acts generate habits, and habits produce character, the formal cause of man's moral condition. The same defect runs through the Pelagian system. Passing from the subject of human freedom, and the effect of action upon conduct and habit, we come to Pelagius' view of sin. According to him, Adam's transgression consisted in an isolated

¹ We make this qualification, because Pelagius himself seems to have recognised to some extent the power of habit and its effect upon the will, in his Letter to Demetrius, 8. See Dr. Philip Schaff's *History of the Christian Church*, vol. iii. p. 804.

² Aristotle, *Ethic. Nicom.* ii. 2, 3, 6; Butler, *Analogy*, i. 5.

act of disobedience to God's command ; and our sin now consists in the mere repetition and imitation of his offence. There was no "original sin," and consequently no hereditary guilt. Adam stood alone in his transgression, and transmitted no evil taint to his posterity, much less any tendency or predisposition to wrong-doing : there was no doubt a bad example, but against this Pelagius complacently set the happier examples of good and prudent men. *Isolation*, then, is the principle of Pelagius and his school ; *organization* is the principle of true philosophy, as tested by the experience and observation of mankind.

§ 10. We have said enough, and we hope not unfairly said it, to show that Pelagius was radically at fault in his deductions, whether tested by divine revelation or human experience. How superior to him in all essential points his great opponent was, will be manifest to the reader of this volume. Not a statement of Scripture, nor a fact of nature, does Augustine find it necessary to soften, or repudiate, or ignore. Hence his writings are valuable in illustrating the harmony between revelation and true philosophy ; we have seen how much of his far-seeing and eminent knowledge was owing to his own deep convictions and discoveries of sin and grace ; perhaps we shall not be wrong in saying, that even to his opponents is due something of his excellence. There can be no doubt that in Pelagius and Cœlestius, and his still more able follower Julianus, of whom we shall hear in a future volume, he had very able opponents—men of earnest character, acute in observation and reasoning, impressed with the truth of their convictions, and deeming it a fit occupation to rationalize the meaning of Scripture in its bearings on human experience. There is a remarkable peculiarity in this respect in the opinions of Pelagius. He accepted the mysteries of *theology*, properly so called, with the most exemplary orthodoxy. Nothing could be better than his exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. But again we find him hemmed in with a perverse isolation. The doctrine of the Trinity, according to him, stands alone ; it sheds no influence on man and his eternal interests ; but in the blessed Scripture, as read by Augustine, there is revealed to man a most intimate relation

between himself and God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as his Creator, his Redeemer, and his Sanctifier. In Pelagianism, then, we see a disjointed and unconnected theory,—a creed which stands apart from practical life, and is not allowed to shape man's conduct,—a system, in short, which falls to pieces for want of the coherence of the true "analogy of the faith" which worketh by love. By exposing, therefore, this incompatibility in the doctrine of his opponents, Augustine shows how irreconcilable are the deductions of their Rationalism with the statements of Revelation. But Rationalism is not confined to any one period. We live to see a bolder Rationalism, which, unlike Pelagius', is absolutely uncompromising in its aims, and (as must be admitted) more consistent in its method. To institute the supremacy of Reason, it destroys more or less the mysteries of Religion. All the miraculous element of the gospel is discarded; God's personal relation to man in the procedures of grace, and man's to God in the discipline of repentance, faith, and love, are abolished: nay, the Divine Personality itself merges into an impalpable, uninfluential Pantheism; while man's individual responsibility is absorbed into a mythical personification of the race. The only sure escape from such a desolation as this, is to recur to the good old paths of gospel faith—"stare super antiquas vias." Our directory for life's journey through these is furnished to us in Holy Scripture; and if an interpreter is wanted who shall be able by competent knowledge and ample experience to explain to us any difficulties of direction, we know none more suited for the purpose than our St. Augustine.

§ 11. But Rationalism is not always so exaggerated as this: in its ordinary development, indeed, it stops short of open warfare with Revelation, and (at whatever cost of logical consistency) it will accommodate its discussions to the form of Scripture. This adaptation gives it double force: there is its own intrinsic principle of uncontrolled liberty in will and action, and there is "the form of godliness," which has weight with unreflective Christians. Hence Pelagianism was undoubtedly popular: it offered dignity to human nature, and flattered its capacity; and this it did without virulence and

with sincerity, under the form of religion. This acquiescence of matter and manner gave it strength in men's sympathies, and has secured for it durability, seeing that there is plenty of it still amongst us; as indeed there always has been, and ever will be, so long as the fatal ambition of Eden (Gen. iii. 5, 6) shall seduce men into a temper of rivalry with God. Writers like Paley (in his *Evidences*) have treated of the triumph of Christianity over difficulties of every kind. Of all the stumblingblocks to the holy religion of our blessed Saviour, not one has proved so influential as its doctrine of GRACE; the prejudice against it, by what St. Paul calls "the natural man" (1 Cor. ii. 14), is ineradicable—and, it may be added, inevitable: for in his independence and self-sufficiency he cannot admit that in himself he is nothing, but requires external help to rescue him from sin, and through imparted holiness to elevate him to the perfection of the blessed. How great, then, is the benefit which Augustine has accomplished for the gospel, in probing the grounds of this natural prejudice against it, and showing its ultimate untenableness—the moment it is tested on the deeper principles of the divine appreciation! No, the ultimate effect of the doctrine and operation of grace is not to depreciate the true dignity of man. If there be the humbling process first, it is only that out of the humility should emerge the exaltation at last (1 Pet. v. 6). I know nothing in the whole range of practical or theoretical divinity more beautiful than Augustine's analysis of the procedures of grace, in raising man from the depths of his sinful prostration to the heights of his last and eternal elevation in the presence and fellowship of God. The most ambitious, who thinks "man was not made for meanness," might be well content with the noble prospect. But his ambition must submit to the conditions; and his capacity both for the attainment and the fruition of such a destiny is given to him and trained by God Himself. "It is so contrived," says Augustine, "in the discipline of the present life, that the holy Church shall arrive at last at that condition of unspotted purity which all holy men desire; and that it may in the world to come, and in a state unmixed with all soil of evil men, and undisturbed by any law of sin resisting the law of the mind, lead the purest

life in a divine eternity. . . . But in whatever place and at what time soever the love which animates the good shall reach that state of absolute perfection which shall admit of no increase, it is certainly not 'shed abroad in our hearts' by any energies either of the nature or the volition that are within us, but 'by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us' (Rom. v. 5), and which both helps our infirmity and co-operates with our strength" (*On Nature and Grace*, pp. 299 and 307).

§ 12. This translation has been made from the (Antwerp) Benedictine edition of the works of St. Augustine, tenth volume, compared with the beautiful reprint by Gaume. Although left to his own resources in making his version, the Translator has gladly availed himself of the learned aid within his reach. He may mention the *Kirchengeschichte* both of Gieseler and Neander [Clark's transl. vol. iv.]; Wigger's *Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus* [1st part]; Shedd's *Christian Doctrine*; Cunningham's *Historical Theology*; Short's *Bampton Lectures* for 1846 [Lect. vii.]; Professor Bright's *History of the Church* from A.D. 313 to A.D. 451; Bishop Forbes' *Explanation of the Thirty-nine Articles* [vol. i.]; Canon Robertson's *History of the Christian Church*, vol. i. pp. 376-392; and especially Professor Mozley's *Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, ch. iii. iv. vi.; and Dr. Philip Schaff's excellent *History of the Christian Church* [Clark, Edinburgh 1869], vol. iii. pp. 783-1028; of which work Dr. Dorner's is by no means exaggerated commendation: "It is," says he, "on account of the beauty of its descriptions, the lucid arrangement of its materials, and the moderation of its decisions, a very praiseworthy work" (Dorner's *History of Protestant Theology* [Clark's translation], vol. ii. p. 449, note 2). This portion of Dr. Schaff's work is an expansion of his able and interesting article on the *Pelagian Controversy*, in the *American Bibliotheca Sacra* of May 1848.

PETER HOLMES.

CONTENTS.



	PAGE
EXTRACT FROM AUGUSTINE'S "RETRACTATIONS" on the <i>De Peccatorum Meritis</i> , etc.,	1

TREATISE I.

ON THE MERITS AND FORGIVENESS OF SINS, AND THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS,	3-154
--	-------

EXTRACT FROM AUGUSTINE'S "RETRACTATIONS" on the <i>De Spiritu et Littera</i> ,	155, 156
--	----------

TREATISE II.

ON THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER,	157-232
---	---------

TREATISE III.

ON NATURE AND GRACE,—

Introductory Note,	233, 234
Extract from the "Retractations,"	235
The Treatise itself,	236-308

TREATISE IV.

ON THE PERFECTION OF MAN'S RIGHTEOUSNESS,¹—

Preface to the Treatise,	309-312
The Treatise itself,	313-356

¹ Or, On Man's Perfect Righteousness.

TREATISE V.		PAGE
ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF PELAGIUS, ¹ —		
Preface to the Treatise,	357-359
Extract from the "Retractations,"	360
The Treatise itself,	361-431

¹ Or, On the Proceedings in the case of Pelagius.

EXTRACT FROM
AUGUSTINE'S "RETRACTATIONS,"

BOOK II. CHAP. 23,

ON THE FOLLOWING TREATISE,

"DE PECCATORUM MERITIS ET REMISSIONE."



A NECESSITY arose which compelled me to write against the new heresy of Pelagius. Our previous opposition to it was confined to sermons and conversations, as occasion suggested, and according to our respective abilities and duties; but it had not yet assumed the shape of a controversy in writing. Certain questions were then submitted to me [by our brethren] at Carthage, to which I was to send them back answers in writing: I accordingly wrote first of all three books, under the title, "*De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*" ["On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins"], in which I mainly discussed the baptism of infants because of original sin, and the grace of God by which we are justified, that is, made righteous; but [I remarked] no man in this life can so keep the commandments which prescribe holiness of life, as to be beyond the necessity of using this prayer for his sins: "Forgive us our trespasses."¹ It is in direct opposition to these principles that they have devised their new heresy. Now throughout these three books I thought it right not to mention any of their names, hoping and desiring that by such reserve they might the more readily be set right; nay more, in the third book (which is really a letter, but reckoned

¹ See Matt. vi. 12.

amongst *the books*, because I wished to connect it with the two previous ones) I actually quoted Pelagius' name with considerable commendation, because his conduct and life were made a good deal of by many persons; and those statements of his which I refuted, he had himself adduced in his writings, not indeed in his own name, but had quoted them as the words of other persons. However, when he was afterwards confirmed in heresy, he defended them with most persistent animosity. Cœlestius, indeed, a disciple of his, had already been excommunicated for similar opinions at Carthage, in a council of bishops, at which I was not present. In a certain passage of my second book I used these words: "Upon some there will be bestowed this blessing at the last day, that they shall not perceive the actual suffering of death in the suddenness of the change which shall happen to them,"¹—reserving the passage for a more careful consideration of the subject; for they will either die, or else by a most rapid transition from this life to death, and then from death to eternal life, as in the twinkling of an eye, they will not undergo the feeling of mortality. This work of mine begins with this sentence: "*However absorbing and intense the anxieties and annoyances.*"

¹ See Book ii. ch. 50.

A TREATISE
ON THE
MERITS AND FORGIVENESS OF SINS, AND
THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS,

By AURELIUS AUGUSTINE, BISHOP OF HIPPO;

IN THREE BOOKS,

ADDRESSED TO MARCELLINUS, A.D. 412.

B O O K I.

IN WHICH HE REFUTES THOSE WHO MAINTAIN, THAT ADAM MUST HAVE DIED EVEN IF HE HAD NEVER SINNED ; AND THAT NOTHING OF HIS SIN HAS BEEN TRANSMITTED TO HIS POSTERITY BY NATURAL DESCENT. HE ALSO SHOWS, THAT DEATH HAS NOT ACCRUED TO MAN BY ANY NECESSITY OF HIS NATURE, BUT AS THE PENALTY OF SIN ; HE THEN PROCEEDS TO PROVE THAT IN ADAM'S SIN HIS ENTIRE OFFSPRING IS IMPLICATED, SHOWING THAT INFANTS ARE BAPTIZED FOR THE EXPRESS PURPOSE OF RECEIVING THE REMISSION OF ORIGINAL SIN.

CHAP. 1.—*Introductory, in the shape of an inscription to his friend Marcellinus.*

HOWEVER absorbing and intense the anxieties and annoyances in the whirl and warmth of which we are engaged with sinful men¹ who forsake the law of God,—[evils] indeed which we may well ascribe even to the fault of the sin which is inherent in us all,—I am unwilling, and, to say the truth, unable, any longer to remain a debtor, my dearest Mar-

¹ This is probably an allusion to the Donatists, who were then fiercely assailing the Catholics.

cellinus, to that zealous affection of yours, which only enhances my own grateful and pleasant estimate of yourself. I am under the impulse [of a twofold emotion]: on the one hand, there is that very love which makes us unchangeably one in the one hope of a change for the better; on the other hand, there is the fear of offending God in yourself, who has endowed you with so earnest a desire, in gratifying which I shall be only serving Him who implanted it in you. And so strongly has this impulse led and attracted me to solve, to the best of my humble ability, the questions which you submitted to me in writing, that my mind has gradually admitted this inquiry to an importance transcending that of all others; [and it will now give me no rest] until I accomplish something, which shall make it manifest that I have yielded, if not a sufficient, yet at any rate an obedient, compliance with your own kind wish and the desire of those to whom these questions are a source of anxiety.

CHAP. 2. [II.]—*If Adam had not sinned, he would never have died.*

They who say that Adam was so formed that he would even without any demerit of sin have died, not as the penalty of sin, but from the necessity of his being, endeavour indeed to refer that passage in the law, which says: "On the day ye eat thereof ye shall surely die,"¹ not to the death of the body, but to that death of the soul which takes place in sin. It is the unbelievers who have died this death, to whom the Lord pointed when He said, "Let the dead bury their dead."² Now what will be their answer, when [we adduce the place where] we read that God, when reproofing and sentencing the first man after his sin, said to him, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return?"³ For it was not in respect of his soul that he was "dust," but clearly by reason of his body, and it was by the death of the self-same body that he was destined to "return to dust." Still, although it was by reason of his body that he was dust, and although he bare about the natural body in which he was created, he would, if he had not sinned, have been changed into a spiritual body, and would have passed into the incorruptible state, which is promised to the faithful

¹ Gen. ii. 17.

² Matt. viii. 22; Luke ix. 60.

³ Gen. iii. 19.

and the saints, without the peril of death. And of this issue we not only are conscious in ourselves of having an earnest desire, but we learn it from the apostle's intimation, when he says: "For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven; if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life."¹ Therefore, if Adam had not sinned, he would not have been divested of his body, but would have been clothed upon with immortality and incorruption, that his mortal [body] might have been absorbed by life; that is, that he might have passed from his natural body to the spiritual body.

CHAP. 3. [III.]—*It is one thing to be mortal, another thing to be subject to death. Enoch and Elijah still alive, in Paradise.*

Nor was there any reason to fear that if he had happened to live on here longer in his natural body, he would have been oppressed with old age, and have gradually, by reason of the senility, arrived at death. For if God granted to the clothes and the shoes of the Israelites that "they waxed not old" during forty years,² what wonder if for obedience it had been by the power of the same [God] allowed to man, that his natural and mortal body should have in it a certain condition, in which he might grow full of years without decrepitude, and, whenever God pleased, pass from mortality to immortality without the medium of death? For even as this very flesh of ours, which we now possess, is not therefore invulnerable, because there happens to be no occasion on which it receives a wound; so also was it not therefore immortal, because there arose no necessity for its dying. Such a condition, whilst still in their natural and mortal body, I suppose, was granted even to those who were translated hence without death.³ For Enoch and Elijah were not reduced to the decrepitude of old age by their long life. But yet I do not believe that they were then changed into that spiritual kind of body, such as is promised in the resurrection, and which the Lord was the first to receive; only they probably do not need those ali-

¹ 2 Cor. v. 2-4.

² Deut. xxix. 5.

³ Gen. v. 24; 2 Kings ii. 11.

ments, which by their use minister refreshment to the body ; ever since their translation, however, they so live, as to enjoy such a sufficiency as was provided during the forty days in which Elijah lived on the cruse of water and the cake without substantial food;¹ or else, if there be any need of such sustenance, they are, it may be, sustained in Paradise in some such way as Adam was, before he brought on himself expulsion therefrom by sinning. And he, as I suppose, was supplied with sustenance against decay from the fruit of the various trees, and from the tree of life with security against the decrepitude of age.

CHAP. 4. [IV.]—*Death accrues to the body owing to sin.*

But in addition to the passage where God in punishment says, "Dust thou art, unto dust shalt thou return,"²—a passage which I cannot understand how any one can apply except to the death of the body,—there are other testimonies likewise, from which it most fully appears that by reason of sin the human race has brought upon itself not spiritual death merely, but the death of the body also. The apostle says to the Romans : "If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness. If therefore the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."³ I apprehend that a sentence which is so clear and open as this only requires to be read and not expounded. *The body*, says he, *is dead*, not through earthly frailty, as being made of the dust of the ground, but *because of sin* ; what more do we want ? And he is most careful in his words : he does not say [the body] is mortal, but *dead*.

CHAP. 5. [V.]—*The words, mortale (capable of dying), mortuum (dead), and moriturus (likely to die) ; man's righteousness, obedience.*

Now previous to the change into the incorruptible state which is promised in the resurrection of the saints, the body may have been *mortal* (capable of dying), although not likely to die ; just as our body in its present state may, so to speak, be capable of sickness, although not likely to suffer

¹ 1 Kings xix. 8.

² Gen. iii. 19.

³ Rom. viii. 10, 11.

sickness. For whose is the flesh which is incapable of sickness, even if from some accident it die before it ever experienced an illness? In like manner was man's body then mortal, but this mortality was to have been superseded by an eternal incorruption, if man had persevered in righteousness, that is to say, obedience. But mortality only itself actually experienced death on account of sin; for the change which is to take place in the resurrection will, in truth, not only not have death incidental to it, which has happened through sin, but it will be even free from mortality, [or the very possibility of death,] which the natural body had before it sinned. He does not say: "He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your *dead* bodies" (although he had previously said, "the body is dead"¹); but his words are: "He shall also quicken your *mortal* bodies;"² so that they are not only no longer dead, but no longer mortal [or capable of dying], since the natural shall by the resurrection become spiritual, and this mortal body shall put on immortality, and mortality shall be absorbed in life.

CHAP. 6. [VI.]—*How it is that the body is dead because of sin.*

One wonders that anything is required clearer than the proof we have given. But we must perhaps be content to hear this clear illustration gainsaid by the position, that we must understand "the dead body" here³ in the sense of the passage where it is said, "Mortify your members which are upon the earth."⁴ Now it is *because of righteousness* and not because of sin that the body is in this sense mortified; for it is to do the works of righteousness that we mortify our bodies which are upon the earth. Unless they suppose that the phrase, "because of sin," is added, not with the view of our understanding that sin has been actually committed, but in order that sin may not be committed—as if it were said, "The body indeed is dead, in order to prevent the commission of sin." What then does he mean in the next clause by adding the words, "because of righteousness," to the statement which he has just made, "The spirit is life?"⁵ For it would

¹ Rom. viii. 10.

³ In Rom. viii. 10.

⁴ Col. iii. 5.

² Rom. viii. 11.

⁵ Rom. viii. 10.

have been enough simply to have mentioned the life of the spirit, to have secured its being understood "in order to prevent the commission of sin;" we should thus understand the two propositions to point to one thing—even that "the body is dead," and "the spirit is life," for the one common purpose of "preventing the commission of sin." So likewise if he had merely meant to say, "because of righteousness," in the sense of "for the purpose of doing righteousness," the two clauses might possibly be referred to this one purpose—to the effect, that "the body is dead," and "the spirit is life," "for the purpose of doing righteousness." But as the passage actually stands, it declares that "the body is dead because of sin," and "the spirit is life because of righteousness," attributing different merits to different things—the demerit of sin to the death of the body, and the merit of righteousness to the life of the spirit. Wherefore if, as no one can doubt, "the spirit is life because of righteousness," that is, by the merit, or as the desert, of righteousness; how ought we, or can we, understand by the statement, "The body is dead because of sin," anything else than that the body is dead owing to the fault or demerit of sin, unless indeed we try to pervert or wrest the plainest sense of Scripture to our own arbitrary will? But besides this, additional light is afforded by the words which follow. For it is by the present tense that he defines the influence [of the twofold condition], when he says, that on the one hand "the body is dead because of sin," since, whilst the body is unrenovated by the resurrection, there remains in it the desert of sin, that is, the necessity of dying; and on the other hand, that "the spirit is life because of righteousness," since, notwithstanding the fact of our being still burdened with "the body of this death,"¹ we have, by the renewal which is begun in our inner man, new aspirations² after the righteousness of faith. Yet, lest man in his ignorance should fail to entertain any hope of the resurrection of the body, he says that the very body which he had just declared to be "dead because of sin" in this world, will in the next world be made alive "because of righteousness,"—and that not only in such a way as to become alive from the dead, but immortal after

¹ Rom. vii. 24.

² Respiration.

its mortality, [that is to say, not only recovering from actual death, but becoming free from all possibility of dying.]

CHAP. 7. [VII.]—*The life of the body the object of hope, the life of the spirit being a prelude to it; Adam's spirit extinct by the death of unbelief.*

Although I am much afraid that so clear a matter may rather be obscured by exposition, I must yet request your attention to the luminous statement of the apostle. "If Christ," says he, "be in you, the body is dead because of sin, but the spirit is life because of righteousness."¹ Now this is said, that men may not suppose that they derive no benefit, or at best but scant benefit, from the grace of Christ, from the fact that they must needs die in the body. For they are bound to remember that, although their body still sustains that desert of sin, which is irrevocably bound to the condition of death, yet their spirit has already begun to live because of the righteousness of faith, although it had actually become extinct by the death, as it were, of unbelief. No small gift, therefore, he [as good as] says, must you suppose to have been conferred upon you, by the circumstance that Christ is in you; inasmuch as in your body, which is dead because of sin, your spirit is even now alive because of righteousness; so that on this very account you should not despair of the life even of your body. "For if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you."² How is it that fumes of controversy still darken so clear a light? The apostle distinctly tells you, that although the body is dead because of sin within you, yet even your mortal bodies shall be made alive because of righteousness, by reason of which even now your spirit is life, —the whole of which process is to be perfected by the grace of Christ, in other words, by His Spirit that dwelleth in you. Well, do men still gainsay? He goes on to tell us how this comes to pass, how that life converts death into itself by mortifying it, [that is, that the spirit of life, by mortifying the body, renders it spiritual and full of life.] "Therefore, brethren," says he, "we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh; for if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye

¹ Rom. viii. 10.

² Ver. 11.

through the spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live."¹ What else does this mean but this: If ye live the way of death, ye shall wholly die; but if by living the way of life ye mortify and slay death, ye shall wholly live?

CHAP. 8. [VIII.]

When to the like purport he says: "By man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead,"² in what other sense can the passage be understood than of the death of the body; for having in view the mention of this, he proceeded to speak of the resurrection of the body, and affirmed it in a most earnest and solemn discourse? In these words, addressed to the Corinthians: "By man came death, and by man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive,"³—what other meaning is indeed conveyed than in the verse in which he says to the Romans, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin?"⁴ Now they will have it, that the death here meant is the death, not of the body, but of the soul, on the pretence that another thing is spoken of to the Corinthians, where they are quite unable to understand the death of the soul, because the subject there treated is the resurrection of the body, which is the antithesis of the death of the body. The reason, moreover, why only death is here mentioned as caused by man, and not sin also, is because the point of the discourse is not about righteousness, which is the antithesis of sin, but about the resurrection of the body, which is contrasted with the death of the body.

CHAP. 9. [IX.]—*Sin passes on to all men by natural descent, and not merely by imitation.*

You tell me in your letter, that they endeavour to twist into some new sense the passage of the apostle, in which he says: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin;"⁵ yet you have not informed me what they suppose to be the meaning of these words. But so far as I have discovered from others, they think that the death which is here mentioned is not the death of the body, which they will not

¹ Rom. viii. 12.

² 1 Cor. xv. 21.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

⁴ Rom. v. 12.

⁵ Rom. v. 12.

allow Adam to have deserved, but that of the soul, which takes place in actual sin; and that this actual sin has not been transmitted by natural descent from the first man to other persons, but by imitation [of his conduct]. Hence, likewise, they refuse to believe that in infants original sin is remitted through baptism, for they contend that no such original sin exists at all in people by their birth. But if the apostle had wished to assert that sin entered into the world, not by natural descent, but by imitation, he would have mentioned as the first offender, not Adam indeed, but the devil, of whom it is written,¹ that "he sinneth from the beginning;" of whom also we read in the Book of Wisdom: "Nevertheless through the devil's envy death entered into the world."² Now, forasmuch as this death came upon men from the devil, not because they were propagated by him, but because they imitated his example, it is immediately added: "And they that do hold of his side do imitate him."³ Accordingly, the apostle, when mentioning sin and death together, which had passed by natural descent from one upon all men, set him down as the introducer thereof from whom the propagation of the human race took its beginning.

CHAP. 10.—*Grace operates internally; it is infused into infants latently in their baptism; the contagion of original sin; slowness of understanding objected to the Catholics by the Pelagians.*

Now all they are imitators of Adam who by disobedience transgress the commandment of God; but [Adam considered as] an example to those who sin, because they choose, is one thing; and [the same Adam considered as] the original from whom all spring, with their birth in sin, is another thing. All His saints, indeed, imitate Christ in the pursuit of righteousness; whence the same apostle, whom we have already quoted, says: "Be ye followers of me, as I am also of Christ."⁴ But besides this imitation, His grace works within us our illumination and justification, by that operation concerning which the same great preacher of His [name] says: "Neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase."⁵ For by His grace He

¹ 1 John iii. 8.

² Wisd. ii. 24.

³ Ver. 25.

⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 1.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

engrafts into His body even baptized infants, who certainly have not yet become able to imitate any one. As therefore He, in whom all are made alive, besides offering Himself as an example of righteousness to those who follow Him, gives also to those who believe on Him the hidden grace of His Holy Spirit, which He secretly infuses even into infants; so likewise he, in whom all die, besides being an example for imitation to those who wilfully transgress the commandment of the Lord, depraved in his own person all who come of his stock by the hidden corruption of his own carnal concupiscence. It is entirely on this account, and for no other reason, that the apostle says: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men; and in this [sin] all have sinned."¹ Now if *I* were to say this, they would raise an objection, and loudly insist that I was incorrect both in expression and in sentiment; for [if couched] in such words as these, they would attribute no importance to the opinion of an ordinary man, but in an apostle they simply refuse to admit such an opinion to be possible. Since, however, these are actually the words of the apostle, to whose authority and doctrine they submit, they charge us with slowness of understanding, while they endeavour to wrest to some unintelligible sense words which were written in a clear and obvious purport. "By one man," says he, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin." This indicates propagation, not imitation; for if imitation were meant, he would mention the devil as the object of the imitation. But, as no one doubts, [the apostle] refers to that first man who is called Adam: "And so," says he, "death passed upon all men."

CHAP. 11. [x.]—*Distinction between actual and original sin. In Adam we were all one man.*² *In Christ alone are we justified.*

Again, in the clause which follows, "And in this [sin]³ all have sinned," how cautiously, rightly, and unambiguously is the statement expressed! For if you understand that sin to be meant which by one man entered into the world, and in

¹ Rom. v. 12.

² See below, Book III. c. vii.; also in the *De Nuptiis*, c. v.; also *Epist.* 136, and *Serm.* 165.

³ Such is Augustine's reading; but see below.

which all have sinned, it is surely clear enough, that the sins which are peculiar to every man, which they themselves commit and which belong simply to them, mean one thing ; and that the one sin, in and by which all have sinned, means another thing, since all were included in that one [primeval] man. If, however, it be not the sin, but this first man that is understood [in this clause, so that it be read] “ in whom ” [not, *in which*] “ all have sinned,” what again can be plainer than even this clear statement ? We read, indeed, of those being justified in Christ who believe in Him, by reason of the secret communion and inspiration of that spiritual grace which makes every one who cleaves to the Lord “ one spirit ” with Him,¹ although His saints also follow His example ; can I find, however, any similar statement made of those, who have followed in the steps of His saints ? Can any man be said to be justified in Paul or in Peter, or in any one whatever of those excellent men whose authority stands high among the people of God ? We are no doubt said to be blessed in Abraham, according to the passage in which the words are addressed to him, “ In thee shall all nations be blessed ”²—for Christ’s sake, who is his seed according to the flesh ; which is still more clearly expressed in the parallel passage : “ In thy seed shall all nations be blessed.” I do not believe that any one can find it anywhere stated in the Holy Scriptures, that a man has ever sinned or still sins “ in the devil,” although all wicked and impious men “ imitate ” him. The apostle, however, has declared concerning the first man, that “ in him all have sinned ; ”³ but notwithstanding there is still a contest about the propagation of sin ; and men oppose to it I know not what nebulous theory of “ imitation.”⁴

CHAP. 12.—*The law could not take away sin.*

Observe also what follows. Having said that “ all have

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 17.

² Gal. iii. 8 ; comp. Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, xxii. 18.

³ Rom. v. 12.

⁴ This was the Pelagian term, expressive of their dogma that original sin stands in the following [or imitation] of Adam, instead of being the fault and corruption of the nature of every man who is naturally engendered of Adam’s offspring ; which doctrine is expressed by Augustine’s word, *propagatio*.

sinned in it [or, in him]," he at once added, "For until the law, sin was in the world."¹ This means that sin could not be taken away even by the law, which entered that sin might the more abound,² whether it be the law of nature, under which every man when arrived at years of discretion only proceeds to add his own sins to original sin, or that very law which Moses gave to the people. "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."³ But sin is not imputed where there is no law."⁴ Now what means the phrase "*is not imputed*," but "*is ignored*," or "*is not reckoned as sin?*" Although the Lord God does not Himself regard it, as if it had never been, since it is written: "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law."⁵

CHAP. 13. [XI.]—*Meaning of the apostle's phrase "the reign of death." The saints of old had no relation to the letter of the law, but to the grace of Christ who was to come.*

"Nevertheless," says he, "death reigned from Adam even unto Moses,"⁶—that is to say, from the first man even to the very law which was promulged^{also} by the divine authority, because even it was unable to abolish the reign of death. Now death must be understood "to reign," whenever the guilt of sin⁷ so dominates in men that it prevents their attainment of that eternal life which is the only true life, and drags them down even to the second death which is penally eternal. This reign of death is only destroyed in any man by the Saviour's grace, which wrought even in the saints of the olden time, all of whom, though previous to the coming of Christ in the flesh, yet lived in relation to His assisting grace, not to the letter of the law, which only knew how to command, but not to help them. In the Old Testament, indeed, that was hidden (owing to the perfectly just dispensation of that period) which is now revealed in the New Testament. Therefore "death reigned from Adam unto Moses," in all

¹ Rom. v. 13.

² Rom. v. 20.

³ Gal. iii. 21, 22.

⁴ Rom. v. 13.

⁵ Rom. ii. 12.

⁶ Rom. v. 14.

⁷ *Reatus peccati.*

who were not assisted by the grace of Christ, that in them the kingdom of death might be destroyed. "Even in those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,"¹ [continues the apostle, meaning] those who had not sinned of their own individual will, as Adam did, but had drawn from him the original sin; "who is the figure of him that was to come,"² because in him was constituted the form of condemnation to his future progeny, who should spring from him by natural descent; so that from him alone all men were born to a condemnation, from which there is no deliverance but in the Saviour's grace. I am quite aware, indeed, that several Latin copies of the Scriptures read the passage thus: "Death reigned from Adam to Moses over them who have sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression;"³ but even this version is referred by those who so read it to the very same purport, for they understand those who have sinned in him to have sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression; so that they are created in his likeness, not only as men born of his manhood, but as sinners born of a sinner, destined to die as he was doomed to die, and under condemnation because he was under condemnation. However, the Greek copies from which the Latin version was made, have all, without exception or nearly so, the reading which I first adduced.

CHAP. 14.

"But," says he, "not as the offence so also is the free gift. For if, through the offence of one, many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by One Man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many."⁴ [*Much more*, are his words,] not *many more*, as to prevalence of number, for, there are not more persons justified than condemned; but it runs, *hath much more abounded*; inasmuch as, while Adam produced sinners from his one sin, Christ has by His grace procured free forgiveness even for the sins which men have of their own accord added by actual transgression to the original sin in which they were born. This he states more clearly still in the sequel.

¹ Rom. v. 14.³ Comp. *Epist.* 157, n. 19.² Rom. v. 14.⁴ Rom. v. 15.

CHAP. 15. [XII.]—*The one sin common to all men. Original sin suffices for condemnation. Degrees of condemnation.*

But observe more attentively what he says, that “through the offence of one, many are dead.” For why should it be on account of the sin of one, and not rather on account of their own sins [that many are dead], if this passage is to be understood as supporting the principle of *imitation*, and not *communication by natural descent*? But mark what follows: “And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.”¹ Now let them tell us, where there is room in these words for the principle of *imitation*. “By one,” says he, “to condemnation.” By one what, but one sin? This much, indeed, he clearly implies in the words which he adds: “But the free gift [or the grace] is of many offences unto justification.” Why, indeed, is the judgment from one offence to condemnation, and the grace from many offences to justification? If original sin is a nullity, would it not follow, not only that grace withdraws men from many offences to justification, but that judgment leads them to condemnation [not from one sin merely, but] from many offences likewise? For assuredly grace does not condone many offences, without judgment in like manner having many offences to condemn. Else, if men are involved in condemnation because of one offence, on the ground that all the offences which are condemned were committed in imitation of that one offence, there is the same reason why men should also be regarded as withdrawn from one offence unto justification, inasmuch as all the offences which are remitted to the justified were committed in imitation of that one offence. But this most certainly was not the apostle’s meaning, when he said: “The judgment, indeed, was from *one* offence unto condemnation, but the grace was from *many* offences unto justification.” We on our side, indeed, can understand the apostle, and see that judgment is predicated of one offence unto condemnation entirely on the ground that, even if there were in men nothing but original sin, it would be sufficient for their condemnation. For however much

¹ Rom. v. 16.

heavier will be their condemnation who have added their own sins to the original offence (and it will be the more severe in individual cases, in proportion to the sins of individuals); still, even that sin alone which was originally derived unto men not only excludes from the kingdom of God, which infants are unable to enter (as they themselves allow), unless they have received the grace of Christ before they die, but also alienates from salvation and everlasting life, which cannot be anything else than the kingdom of God, to which fellowship with Christ alone introduces us.

CHAP. 16. [XIII.]

And from this we gather that we have derived from Adam, in whom all have sinned, not all our actual sins, but only original sin; whereas from Christ, in whom we are all justified, we obtain the remission not merely of that original sin, but of the rest of our sins also, which we have added by our actual transgression. Hence it runs: "Not as by the one that sinned, so also is the free gift." For the judgment, to be sure, unless remitted, is from one sin—and that the original sin—capable of drawing us into condemnation; whilst grace conducts us to justification from the remission of many sins,—that is to say, not simply from the original sin, but from all others also whatsoever.

CHAP. 17.

"For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of righteousness shall reign in life by one, even Jesus Christ."¹ Why did death reign owing to the sin of one, unless it was that men were bound by the chain of death in that one man in whom all men sinned, even though they added no sins of their own? Otherwise it was not owing to the sin of one that death reigned through one; rather it was owing to the manifold offences of many, [operating] through each individual offender. For if the reason why men have died for the delinquency of another be, that they have followed and imitated him as their predecessor in delinquency, it must even result, and *that* with much greater propriety, that he died for the offence of

¹ Rom. v. 17.

one, whom the devil by his pre-eminent influence so wrought on as to induce him to commit the offence. Adam, however, used no influence to persuade his followers; and the many who are said to have imitated him have, in fact, either not heard of his existence at all or of his having committed any such sin as is ascribed to him, or [if they have heard of the history], simply refuse to believe it. How much more correct, therefore, as I have already remarked,¹ would the apostle have been in setting forth the devil as the first [offender], and telling us that sin and death had passed from him only upon us all, if he had in this passage meant to speak of imitation and not of propagation? For there is much stronger reason for saying that Adam is an imitator of the devil, since he had in *him* an actual instigator to sin; if, [as it would seem], one may be an imitator even of him who has never used any particular persuasion of such a kind, or of whom he is absolutely ignorant. But what is implied in the clause, "They which receive abundance of grace and righteousness," but that the grace of remission is given not only to that sin in which all have sinned, but to those offences likewise which men have actually committed besides; and that on those [happy recipients of the grace] so great a righteousness is freely bestowed, that, although Adam gave way to him who persuaded him to sin, they at any rate yield not even to the coercion of the same tempter? Again, what mean the words, "Much more shall they reign in life," when the fact is, that the reign of death drags much the more down to eternal punishment, unless we understand those to be really mentioned in both clauses, who pass from Adam to Christ, in other words, from death to life; because in the life eternal they shall reign without end, and thus exceed the reign of death which has prevailed within them only temporarily and with a termination?

CHAP. 18.

"Therefore as by the offence of one [judgment came] upon all men to condemnation, even so by the justification of One [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life."² This "offence of one," if we are bent on [the theory of]

¹ See above, ch. 9.² Rom. v. 18.

imitation, can only be the devil's offence. Since, however, it is clearly mentioned in reference to Adam and not the devil, it follows that we have no other alternative than to understand the principle of natural propagation, and not that of imitation, to be here implied. [XIV.] Now when he says in reference to Christ, "By the *justification* of one," he has more expressly stated our doctrine than if he were to say, "By the *righteousness* of one;" inasmuch as he mentions that justification whereby Christ justifies the ungodly, and which he did not propose as an object of imitation, for He alone is capable of effecting this. Now it was quite competent for the apostle to say, and to say rightly: "Be ye followers and imitators of me, as I also am of Christ;"¹ but he could never say: Be ye justified by me, as I also am by Christ;—since there may be, and indeed actually are and have been, many righteous men, and worthy of imitation; whereas none is righteous, and at the same time conferring justification, but Christ alone. Whence it is said: "To the man that believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."² Now if any man had it in his power confidently to declare, "I justify you," it would necessarily follow that he could also say, "Believe in me." But it has never been in the power of any of the saints of God to say this except the King of saints,³ who said: "Ye believe in God, believe also in me;"⁴ so that, inasmuch as He justifies the ungodly, to the man who believes in Him in that capacity his faith is imputed for righteousness.

CHAP. 19. [XV.]—*Sin is from natural descent, as righteousness is from regeneration; how "ALL" are sinners through Adam, and "ALL" are just through Christ.*

Now if it is imitation only that makes men sinners through Adam, why does not imitation likewise alone make men righteous through Christ? "For," he says, "as by the offence of one [judgment came] upon all men to condemnation; even so by the justification of one [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life."⁵ [On the theory of imitation], then, those who are in this passage antithetically mentioned as the

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 16.

² Rom. iv. 5.

³ Sanctus sanctorum.

⁴ John xiv. 1.

⁵ Rom. v. 13.

“one” and the “one,” must not be regarded as Adam and Christ, but Adam and Abel. For although many sinners have preceded us in the time of this present life, and have been imitated in their sin by those who have sinned at a later date, yet they will have it, that only Adam is mentioned as he in whom all have sinned by following his example, on the ground that he was the very first man who sinned. And on the same principle, Abel ought certainly to have been mentioned, as he in whom alone all men likewise are justified by imitation of his good example, inasmuch as he was himself the first man who lived a holy life. If, however, it be thought necessary to take into the account some critical period having relation to the beginning of the New Testament, and Christ be taken as the leader of the righteous and the object of their imitation, then Judas, who betrayed Him, ought to be set down as the leader of the class of sinners. Moreover, if → Christ alone is He in whom all men are justified, on the ground that it is not simply the imitation of His example which makes men just, but His grace which regenerates men by the Spirit, then also Adam is the only one in whom all have sinned, on the ground that it is not the mere following of his evil example that makes men sinners, but the penalty which generates through the flesh. Hence the terms “all men” and “all men,” [used by the apostle in his antithetical clauses.] For not they who are generated through Adam are actually the very same as those who are regenerated through Christ; but yet the language of the apostle is strictly correct, because as none partakes of carnal generation except through Adam, so no one shares in the spiritual except through Christ. For if any could be generated in the flesh, yet not by Adam; and if in like manner any could be generated in the Spirit, and not by Christ; clearly “all” could not be spoken of either in the one class or in the other. But these “all”¹ the apostle afterwards describes as “many;”² for obviously, under certain circumstances, the “all” may be but a few. The carnal generation, however, embraces “many,” and the spiritual generation also includes “many;” although the “many” of the spiritual are less numerous than the “many” of the carnal. But as

¹ The word is “all” in ver. 18.

² See ver. 19.

the one embraces *all* men whatever, so the other includes *all* righteous men ; because as in the former case none can be a man without the carnal generation, so in the other class no one can be a righteous man without the spiritual generation ; in both instances, therefore, there are “ many : ” “ For as by the disobedience of one man *many* were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall *many* be made righteous.”¹

CHAP. 20.—*Original sin alone is contracted by natural birth.*

“ Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound.”² This addition to original sin men now made of their own wilfulness, not through Adam ; but even this is done away and remedied by Christ, because “ where sin abounded, grace did much more abound ; that as sin hath reigned unto death”³—even that sin which men have not derived from Adam, but have added of their own accord—“ even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life.”⁴ There is, however, no righteousness except through Christ, as there are no sins except through Adam. Therefore, after saying, “ As sin hath reigned unto death,” he did not add in the same clause “ *by one,*” or “ *by Adam,*” because he had already spoken of that sin which was abounding when the law entered, and which, of course, was not original sin, but the sin of man’s own wilful commission. But [here the case is different ; for] after he has said : “ Even so might grace also reign through righteousness unto eternal life,” he at once adds, “ through Jesus Christ our Lord ;”⁵ because, whilst by carnal generation only original sin is contracted, yet by spiritual regeneration there is effected the remission not of original sin only, but also of the sins of man’s own voluntary and actual commission.

CHAP. 21. [XVI.]—*Unbaptized infants damned, but in a most modified way ;⁶ the penalty of Adam’s sin, the grace of his body lost.*

It may therefore be correctly affirmed, that such infants as quit the body without being baptized will be involved in condemnation, but of the mildest character. That person, therefore, greatly deceives both himself and others, who teaches

¹ Rom. v. 19.

² Rom. v. 20.

³ Rom. v. 21.

⁴ Rom. v. 21.

⁵ Rom. v. 21.

⁶ See Augustine’s *Enchiridion*, c. 93, and *Contra Julianum*, v. 11.

that they will not be involved in condemnation; whereas the apostle says: "Judgment [hath arisen] from one offence to condemnation;"¹ and again a little after: "By the offence of one [judgment came] upon all persons to condemnation."² When, indeed, Adam sinned by not obeying God, then his body—although it was a natural and mortal body—lost the grace whereby it used in every part of it to be obedient to the soul. Then there arose in men affections common to the brutes which are productive of shame, and which made man ashamed of his own nakedness.³ Then also, by a certain morbid condition which was conceived in men from a suddenly injected and pestilential corruption, it was brought about that they lost that firmness of life in which they were created, and, by reason of the mutations which they experienced in the stages of life, issued at last in death. However many were the years they lived in their subsequent life, yet they began to die on the day when they received the law of death, because they kept verging towards old age. For that possesses not even a moment's stability, but glides away without respite or recovery, which by constant change perceptibly advances to an end which does not produce perfection, but utter exhaustion. Thus, then, was fulfilled what God had spoken: "In the day that ye eat thereof, ye shall surely die."⁴ As a consequence, then, of this disobedience of the flesh and this law of sin and death, whoever is born of the flesh has need of spiritual regeneration—not only that he may reach the kingdom of God, but even that he may be freed from the damnation of sin. Hence [arise the two opposite conditions]; men are on the one hand born in the flesh liable to sin and death from the first Adam, and on the other hand are born again in baptism associated with the righteousness and eternal life of the second Adam; even as it is written in the book of Ecclesiasticus: "Of the woman came the beginning of sin, and through her we all die."⁵ Now whether it be said of the woman or of the man, both statements pertain to the first man; since (as we know) the woman is of the man, and the two are one flesh. Whence also it is written: "And they

¹ Rom. v. 16.² Ver. 18.³ Gen. iii. 10.⁴ Gen. ii. 17.⁵ Eccclus. xxv. 24.

twain shall be one flesh; wherefore," the Lord says, "they are no more twain, but one flesh."¹

CHAP. 22. [XVII.]—*To infants personal sin cannot be attributed.*

They, therefore, who say that the reason why infants are baptized, is, that they may have the remission of the sin which they have themselves committed in their life, not what they have derived from Adam, may be refuted without much difficulty. For whenever these persons shall have reflected within themselves a little, uninfluenced by any polemical spirit, on the absurdity of their statement, how unworthy it is, in fact, of serious discussion, they will at once change their opinion. But if they will not do this, we shall not so completely despair of men's common sense, as to have any fears that they will induce others to adopt their views. They are themselves driven to adopt their opinion, if I am not mistaken, by their prejudice for some other theory; and therefore, feeling themselves obliged to confess that sins are remitted to the baptized, and being unwilling to allow that the sin was derived from Adam which they admit to be remitted to infants, they were obliged to charge infancy itself with actual sin; as if by bringing this charge against infancy a man could become the more safe himself, when accused and unable to answer his assailant! However, let us, as I suggested, pass by such opponents as these; indeed, we require neither words nor quotations of Scripture to prove the sinlessness of infants, so far as their conduct in life is concerned; this life they spend, such is the recency of their birth, within their very selves, since it escapes the cognizance of human perception, which has no data or support whereon to sustain any controversy on the subject.

CHAP. 23. [XVIII.]—*He refutes those who allege that infants are baptized not for the remission of sins, but for the obtaining of the kingdom of heaven.*²

But those persons raise a question, and appear to adduce an argument deserving of consideration and discussion, who say that new-born infants receive baptism not for the remission of sin, but that they may have a spiritual creation³ and

¹ Matt. xix. 5, 6.

² See below, c. 26; also *De Peccato orig.* c. 19–24; also *Serm.* 294.

³ We adopt this reading after three mss., but the Benedictine text has "non

be born again in Christ, and become partakers even of the kingdom of heaven, and by the same means children and heirs of God, and joint-heirs of Christ. And yet, when you ask them, whether, if [infants are] not baptized, and are not made joint-heirs with Christ and partakers of the kingdom of heaven, they have at any rate the blessing of eternal life in the resurrection of the dead, they are extremely perplexed, and find no way out of their difficulty. For what Christian is there who would allow it to be said, that any one could attain to eternal salvation without being born again in Christ, —[a result] which He meant to be effected through baptism, at the very time when such a sacrament was purposely instituted for men being regenerated with a view to eternal salvation? Whence the apostle says: “Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the laver¹ of regeneration.”² This salvation, however, according to him, consists in hope, while we live here below. He says, “For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.”³ Who then could be so bold as to affirm, that without the regeneration of which the apostle speaks, infants could attain to eternal salvation, as if Christ died not for them? For “Christ died for the ungodly.”⁴ As for them, however, who (as is manifest) never did an ungodly act in all their life, if also they are not bound by any bond of sin in their original nature, how did He die for them, who died for *the ungodly*? If they were hurt by no malady of original sin, how is it they are carried to the Physician Christ, for the express purpose of receiving the sacrament of eternal salvation, by the pious anxiety of those who run to Him? Why rather is it not said to them in the Church: Take hence these innocents: “they that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick;”—Christ “came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance?”⁵ There never has been heard,

habentes,” etc.; which means, “that they may be created in Christ, *not* having the spiritual procreation,” whatever that may mean.

¹ Lavarum.

² Tit. iii. 5.

³ Rom. viii. 24, 25.

⁴ Rom. v. 6.

⁵ Luke v. 31, 32.

there never is heard, there never will be heard in the Church, such a fiction concerning Christ.

CHAP. 24. [XIX.]

And let no one suppose that infants ought to be brought to baptism, because, as they are not sinners, so they are not righteous; how then do some remind us of the Lord's saying, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven;"¹ and hold that the Lord thus commends this tender age as meritorious? For if this is not said of infants because of their resemblance to the grace of humility (since humility makes [us] infants), but from the meritoriousness of the life of children, then of course infants must be righteous persons; otherwise, it could not be correctly said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," for heaven can only belong to the righteous. But probably, after all, it is not a right opinion of the meaning of the Lord's words, to make Him commend the life of infants when He says, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven;" inasmuch as *that* may be their true sense, which makes Christ adduce the tender age of infancy as a likeness of humility. Well, then, perhaps we must revert to the tenet which I mentioned just now, that infants ought to be baptized, because, although they are not sinners, they are yet not righteous. But it would seem as if there were an answer to this view, in the words of Christ: "I came not to call the righteous." Whom then, [O Lord,] didst Thou come to call? He immediately goes on to say: "—but sinners to repentance." Therefore it follows, that, however righteous they may be, if also they are not sinners, He came not to call them, who said of Himself: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners." They therefore seem, not vainly only, but even wickedly to rush to His baptism, who does not invite them,—an opinion, which God forbid that we should entertain. He calls them, then, as a Physician who is not wanted for those that are whole, but for those that are sick; and who came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance. Now, inasmuch as infants are not held bound by any sins of their own actual life, it is the guilt of original sin

¹ Matt. xix. 14.

which is healed in them by the grace of Him who saves them by the laver of regeneration.

CHAP. 25.—*Infants are described as believers and as penitents. Sins alone separate between God and men.*

Some one will say: How then are mere infants called to repentance? Is it possible for them at so tender an age to have anything to repent of? The answer to this is: If they must not be called penitents on the ground of their not having the experience of one that repents, neither must they be called believers, because they likewise have not the faculty of believing. But if they are rightly called believers,¹ because they in a certain sense profess faith by the words of those who bring them to baptism, why are they not also held to possess the previous grace of repentance, when they are proved to renounce the world and the devil by the profession again of those who bring them to the font? The whole of this is done in hope, on the strength of the sacrament and the divine grace, which the Lord has bestowed upon the Church. But yet who knows not that the baptized infant fails to be [ultimately] benefited from what he received as a little child, if on coming to years of reason he fails to believe and to abstain from unlawful desires? If, however, the infant departs from the present life after he has received baptism, the guilt in which he was involved by original sin being [thereby] done away, he shall be made perfect in that light of truth, which, as it remains unchangeable for evermore, illumines the justified in the presence of their Maker. For it is only sins which separate between men and God; and these are done away by Christ's grace, through whose mediation we are reconciled, when He justifies the ungodly.

CHAP. 26. [XX.].—*No one, except he be baptized, rightly comes to the table of the Lord.*

Now they take alarm from the statement of the Lord, when He says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;"² because in His own explanation of the passage He affirms, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."³ And

¹ See below, c. 26 and 40; also Book iii. c. 2; also *Epist.* 98, and *Serm.* 294.

² John iii. 3.

³ Ver. 5.

so they try to ascribe to unbaptized infants, by the merit of their innocence, the gift of salvation and eternal life, but at the same time, owing to their being unbaptized, to exclude them from the kingdom of heaven. But how novel and astonishing is such an assumption, as if there could possibly be salvation and eternal life without heirship with Christ, [and] without the kingdom of heaven! Of course they have their refuge, whither to escape and hide themselves, because the Lord does not say, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot have life, but—"he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." If indeed He had said *that*, there could have risen not a moment's doubt. Well, then, let us remove the doubt [which they import]; let us now listen to the Lord, and not to men's notions and conjectures. Let us, I say, hear what the Lord says—not indeed concerning the sacrament of baptism, but concerning the sacrament of His own holy table, to which none but a baptized person has a right to approach: "Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye shall have no life in you."¹ What do we want more? What answer to this can be adduced, unless it be by that obstinacy which ever resists the constancy of manifest truth?

CHAP. 27.

Will, however, any man be so bold as to say that this statement [of the Lord's] has no relation to infants, and that they can have life in them without partaking of His body and blood—on the ground that He does not say, Except a man eat (as in the phrase about baptism, "Except a man be born again"), but "*Except ye eat*;" as if He were addressing those who were able to hear and to understand, which of course infants cannot do? But the man who says this is inattentive [to the circumstances of the case]; because, unless *all* are embraced in the statement, that without the body and the blood of the Son of man men cannot have life, it is to no purpose that the elder age has this provision. For if you attend to the mere words, and not to the meaning, of the Lord as He speaks, this passage may very well seem to have been spoken merely to the people whom He happened at the moment to be addressing;

¹ John vi. 53.

because He does not say [in a general phrase], Unless any man eat; but [personally], Except *ye* eat. What also becomes of the statement which He makes in the same context on this very point: "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world?"¹ For, according to this statement, we find that that sacrament pertains virtually to ourselves, who were not in existence at the time the Lord spoke these words; for we cannot possibly say that we do not belong to "the world," for the life of which Christ gave His flesh. Who indeed can doubt that in the term *world* all persons are indicated who enter the world by being born? For, as He says in another passage, "The children of this world beget and are begotten."² From all this it follows, that even for the life of *infants* was His flesh given, which He gave for the life of the world; and that even they will not have life if they eat not the flesh of the Son of man.

CHAP. 28.

Hence also that other statement: "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into His hand. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; while he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."³ Now in which of these classes must we place infants—amongst those who believe on the Son, or amongst those who believe not the Son? In neither, say some, because, as they are not yet able to believe, so must they not be deemed capable of unbelief. This, however, the rule of the Church does not indicate, for it joins baptized infants to the number of the faithful. Now if they who are baptized are, by virtue of the excellence and administration of so great a sacrament, still reckoned in the number of the faithful, although by their heart and mouth they do not literally perform what appertains to the action of faith and confession, surely they who have lacked the sacrament must be classed amongst those who do not believe on the Son; and therefore, if they shall depart this life without this grace, they will have to encounter what is written concerning such—they shall not have life, but the

¹ John vi. 52.

² Generant et generantur; Luke xx. 34.

³ John iii. 34, 35.

wrath of God abideth on them. Whence could this result to those who clearly have no sins of their own, if they are not held to be obnoxious to original sin?

CHAP. 29. [XXI.]—*It is an inscrutable mystery why some infants depart this life balked of baptism, and others not; through faith we attain to understanding and knowledge.*

Now there is much significance in what He says. His words are not, "The wrath of God *shall* come upon him," but "The wrath of God *abideth* on him." For from this wrath (in which we are all involved under sin, and of which the apostle says, "For we too were once by nature the children of wrath, even as others"¹) nothing delivers us but the grace of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. The reason why this grace comes upon one man and not on another may be a secret reason, but it cannot be an unjust one. For "is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid."² We must first bend our necks to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, in order that we may each arrive at knowledge and understanding through faith. It is not said in vain, "Thy judgments are a great deep, O Lord."³ The profundity of this "deep" the apostle, as if with a feeling of dread, notices in that exclamation: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!" He had indeed previously noticed the wonderful character of this depth, when he said: "For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that He might have mercy upon all."⁴ Then struck, as it were, with a horrible fear of this abyss, he goes on to say: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and in Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen."⁵ How utterly insignificant, then, is our faculty for discussing the justice of God's judgments, and for the consideration of His gratuitous grace, which, as men have no prevenient merits for deserving it, cannot be partial or unrighteous, and which does not disturb us when

¹ Eph. ii. 3.

² Rom. ix. 14.

³ Ps. xxxvi. 6.

⁴ Rom. xi. 32.

⁵ Rom. xi. 33-36.

it is bestowed upon unworthy men, as much as when it is denied to those who are equally unworthy!

CHAP. 30.

Now those very persons, who think it unjust that infants which depart this life without baptism should be deprived not only of the kingdom of God, into which they themselves admit that none but such as are regenerated through baptism can enter, but also of eternal life and salvation, when they ask how it can be just that one man should be freed from original sin and another not, although the condition of both of them is the same, might really answer their own question, and *that* on their own terms, [by determining] how it can be so frequently just and right that one man should have baptism administered to him whereby to enter into the kingdom of God, and another not be so favoured, although the case of both is alike. For if the question disturbs him, why, of the two persons, who are both equally involved in original sin, the one is loosed from that bond on whom baptism is conferred, and the other is not released on whom such grace is not bestowed, why is he not similarly disturbed by the fact that of two persons, [whom he assumes to be] equally innocent by nature, one receives baptism, whereby he is able to enter into the kingdom of God, and the other does not receive it, so that he is incapable of approaching the kingdom of God? Now in both cases one recurs to the apostle's outburst of wonder, "O the depth of the riches!" Again, let me be informed, why of two baptized infants one is taken away, so that his understanding undergoes no change from a wicked life,¹ and the other survives, destined to become an impious man? Suppose both were carried off, would not both enter the kingdom of heaven? And yet there is no unrighteousness with God.² How is it that no one is moved, no one is driven to the expression of wonder amidst such depths, by the circumstance that some children are vexed by the unclean spirit, while others experience no such pollution, and others again, as Jeremiah, are sanctified even in their mother's womb;³ whereas all men, if there is original sin, are equally guilty; or else equally innocent if there is no original sin? Whence this great

¹ Wisdom iv. 11.

² Rom. ix. 14.

³ Jer. i. 5.

diversity, except in the fact that God's judgments are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out ?

CHAP. 31. [XXII.]—*He refutes those who suppose that souls, on account of sins committed in another state, are thrust into bodies suited to their merits, in which they are more or less tormented. There is no salvation for the man to whom Christ has not been preached.*

Perhaps, however, the now exploded and rejected opinion must be resumed, that souls which once sinned in their heavenly abode, descend by stages and degrees to bodies suited to their deserts, and, as a penalty for their previous life, are more or less tormented by corporeal chastisements. To this opinion Holy Scripture indeed presents a most manifest contradiction ; for when recommending divine grace, it says : “ For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth, it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger.”¹ And yet they who entertain such an opinion are actually unable to escape the perplexities of this question, but, embarrassed and straitened by them, are compelled to exclaim like others, “ O the depth !” For whence does it come to pass that a person shall from his earliest boyhood show greater moderation, mental excellence, and temperance, and shall to a great extent conquer lust, shall hate avarice, detest luxury, and rise to a greater eminence and aptitude in the other virtues, and yet live in such a place as to be unable to hear the grace of Christ preached ?—for “ how shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed ? or how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard ? and how shall they hear without a preacher ?”²—while another man, although of a tardy mind, addicted to lust, and covered with disgrace and crime, shall be so directed as to hear, and believe, and be baptized, and be taken away,—or, if permitted to remain longer here, lead the rest of his life in a manner that shall bring him praise ? Now where did these two persons acquire characters deserving such diverse issues,—I do not say, causing the one to believe and the other not to believe, for that is a matter for a man's own will ; but providing that the other should hear in

¹ Rom. ix. 11, 12.

² Rom. x. 14.

order to believe, and that the other should not hear, for this is not within man's power? Where, I say, did they acquire the merit of such different issues? If they had indeed passed any part of their life in heaven, so as to be thrust down, or (if you like) glide gently down, to this world, and to tenant such bodily receptacles as are fitted to their own former life, then of course that man ought to be supposed to have led the better life previous to his present body of death, who did not much deserve to be burdened with such a body for the purpose of possessing a good disposition, and of being importuned by the milder desires which he could easily overcome; and yet, [strange to say,] he did not deserve to have that grace preached to him whereby alone he could be delivered from the ruin of the second death. Whereas the other, who was hampered with a grosser body, as a penalty—so they suppose—for his worse deserts, and was accordingly possessed of obtuser affections, whilst he was in the violent ardour of his lust, succumbing to the snares of the flesh, and by his wicked life aggravating his former sins, which had brought him to such a pass, by a still more abandoned course of earthly pleasures, [was arrested in his career, and] either heard upon the cross, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise,"¹ or else joined himself to some apostle, by whose preaching he became a changed man, and was saved by the washing of regeneration,—so that where sin once abounded, grace did much more abound. What answer they can get out of this, I am at a loss to know, in their wish to maintain God's righteousness by human conjectures, who, knowing nothing of the depths of grace, have woven webs of improbable fable.

CHAP. 32.—*The case of the Moriones (certain idiots and simpletons) adverted to; one of these exhibited a remarkable sensitiveness whenever the name of Christ was insulted, notwithstanding his stupid insensibility to an injury done to himself.*

Now a good deal may be said of men's strange vocations,—either such as we have read about, or have experienced ourselves,—which go to overthrow the opinion of those persons who think that, previous to the possession of their bodies, men's souls passed through certain lives peculiar to them—

¹ Luke xxiii. 43.

selves, in which they must come to this, and experience in the present life either good or evil, according to the difference of their individual deserts. My anxiety, however, of bringing this work to an end does not permit me to dwell longer on these topics. But on one point, which among many I have found to be a very strange one, I will say something. Following those persons who suppose that souls are oppressed with earthly bodies in a greater or a less degree of grossness, according to the deserts of the life which had been passed in celestial bodies previous to the assumption of the present one, who is there among them that would not affirm that men previous to this life had sinned with an especial amount of enormity, deserving to lose all mental light, so as to be born with sensation akin to brute animals,—men who are (I will not say most slow in intellect, for this is very commonly said of others also, but) so stupid and silly as to make a show of their fatuity for the amusement of clever people, even with idiotic gestures,¹ whom the vulgar call *Moriones* (brainless fools), after the Greek designation [for a simpleton—*Μωρός*]? And yet there was once a certain person of this class, who was so imbued with Christian feeling, that although he used to bear with an endurance which almost amounted to an imbecile indifference any amount of injury to himself, he was yet so impatient of any contumelious treatment of the name of Christ, or of the reverence of it in himself, with which he was so imbued, that he could never refrain, whenever his gay and clever audience proceeded to blaspheme the sacred name, as they sometimes would in order to provoke his patience, from pelting them with stones; and on these occasions he would show no favour even to persons of rank. Well, now, such persons are predestinated and created, as I suppose, to understand, so far as they are able, that God's grace and Spirit, "which bloweth where it listeth,"² does not pass over any kind of disposition in the sons of mercy, nor in like manner does it omit from its notice any sort of character in

¹ We here follow the reading *cerriti*; other readings are,—*curati* (with studied folly), *cirradi* (with effeminate foppery), and *citrati* (decking themselves with *citrus* leaves).

² John iii. 8.

the children of wrath, so that "he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."¹ They, however, who affirm that souls severally receive different earthly bodies, more or less gross according to the merits of their former life, and that their abilities as men vary according to the self-same merits, so that some minds are sharper and others more obtuse, [must answer me one question,]—is the grace of God also dispensed for the liberation of men from their sins according to the deserts of their former existence? What will they have to say in reply on this point? How, [for instance,] will they be able to attribute to the man of whom we have been speaking a previous life of so disgraceful a character that he deserved to be born an idiot, and at the same time so meritorious a career as to entitle him to a preference in the award of the grace of Christ over many men of the acutest intellect?

CHAP. 33.—*Christ is the Saviour and Redeemer even of infants.*

Let us therefore give in and yield our assent to the authority of Holy Scripture, which knows not how either to be deceived or to deceive; and as we do not believe that men as yet unborn have done any good or evil for raising a difference in their moral deserts, so let us by no means doubt that all men are under that sin which came into the world by one man, and has passed through unto all men; and that from this sin nothing frees us but the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ. [XXIII.] His remedial advent is needed by those that are sick, not by the whole: for He came not to call the righteous, but sinners; and into His kingdom shall enter no one that is not born again of water and the Spirit; nor shall any one attain salvation and eternal life except in His kingdom,—since the man who believes not in the Son, and eats not His flesh, shall not have life, but the wrath of God remains upon him. Now from this sinful condition, from this sick state, from this wrath of God (of which by nature they are children who have original sin, even if they in their lifetime add none of their own commission), none delivers them, except the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world; except the Physician, who came not for the sake of the sound, but of the sick; except the Saviour, concerning whom

¹ 1 Cor. i. 31.

it was said to the human race: "Unto you there is born this day a Saviour;"¹ except the Redeemer, by whose blood our debt is blotted out. For who would dare to say that Christ is not the Saviour and Redeemer of infants? But from what does He save them, if there is no malady of original sin within them? From what does He redeem them, if through their origin from the first man they are not sold under sin? Let there be then no eternal salvation promised to infants out of our own mere whim and will, without Christ's baptism; for none is promised in that Holy Scripture which is to be preferred to all human authority and opinion.

CHAP. 34. [XXIV.] *Baptism is called salvation; and the Eucharist, life, by the Christians of Carthage. The ancient and apostolic tradition.*

The Christians of Carthage have an excellent name for the sacraments, when they say that baptism is nothing else than "salvation," and the sacrament of the body of Christ nothing else than "life." Whence, however, was this derived, but from that primitive, as I suppose, and apostolic tradition, by which the Churches of Christ maintain it to be an inherent principle, that without baptism and partaking of the supper of the Lord it is impossible for any man to attain to salvation and everlasting life? So much also does Scripture testify, according to the words which we already quoted. For wherein does their opinion, who designate baptism by the term *salvation*, differ from what is written: "He *saved us* by the washing [or laver] of regeneration?"² or from Peter's statement: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also *now save us*?"³ Then as for those who call the sacrament of the Lord's Supper *life*, what else do they say than that which is written: "I am the *living bread* which came down from heaven;"⁴ or that other statement: "The bread that I shall give is my flesh, which I will give for *the life* of the world;"⁵ or again: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye shall have no life in you?"⁶ If, therefore, as so many important scriptures agree in testifying, neither salvation nor eternal life can be hoped for by any man without baptism and the Lord's body and blood, it is vain to promise

¹ Luke ii. 11.

² Tit. iii. 5.

³ 1 Pet. iii. 21.

⁴ John vi. 51.

⁵ John vi. 51.

⁶ John vi. 53.

these blessings to infants without these [sacraments]. Moreover, if it be only sins that separate man from salvation and eternal life, there is nothing else in infants which these sacraments can be the means of removing, but the guilt of [original] sin,—respecting which guilty nature it is written, that “no one is clean, not even if his life be only that of a day.”¹ Whence also that exclamation of the Psalmist: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me!”² This is either said in the person of our common humanity, or of himself only does David speak. Even if the latter be the sense, it can have no reference to fornication, of course, because David was born in lawful wedlock. We therefore ought not to doubt that even for the baptism of infants was that precious blood shed, which previous to its actual effusion was so given, and applied in the sacrament, that it was said [by Him who gave His life for us,] “This is my blood, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins.”³ Now they who will not allow that they are under sin, deny that there is any liberation. For what is there that men are liberated from, if they are held to be bound by no bondage of sin?

CHAP. 35. *Unless infants are baptized, they remain in darkness.*

“I am come,” says Christ, “a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness.”⁴ Now what does this passage show us, but that every person is in darkness who does not believe on Him, and that it is by believing on Him that he escapes from this permanent state of darkness? What do we understand by the *darkness* but sin? And whatever else it may embrace in its meaning, at any rate he who believes not in Christ will “abide in darkness,”—which, of course, is a penal state, not as the darkness of the night necessary for the refreshment of living beings. [xxv.] So that infants, unless they pass into the number of believers through the sacrament which was divinely instituted for this purpose, will undoubtedly remain in this darkness.

CHAP. 36. *Some have concluded from the gospel, that infants, as soon as they are born, are enlightened.*

Some, however, understand that as soon as children are born they are enlightened; and they derive this opinion from

¹ Job xiv. 4 (Sept.).

² Ps. li. 5.

³ Matt. xxvi. 28.

⁴ John xii. 46.

the passage: "That was the true Light, which lighteth every one that cometh into the world."¹ Well, if this be the case, it is quite astonishing how it can be that those who are thus enlightened by the only-begotten Son, who was the Word in the beginning with God, and [Himself] God, are not admitted into the kingdom of God, nor are heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ. For that such an inheritance is not bestowed upon them except through baptism, even they who hold the opinion in question do acknowledge. Then, again, if they are (though already illuminated) thus admitted to be unfit for entrance into the kingdom of God, they at all events ought gladly to receive baptism, because, at least, they are fit for it; but, strange to say, we see how reluctant infants are to submit to baptism, resisting even with strong crying. And this ignorance of theirs we think lightly of at their time of life, so that we fully administer the sacraments, which we know to be serviceable to them, even although they struggle against them. And why, too, does the apostle say, "Be not children in understanding,"² if their minds have been already enlightened, [according to the hypothesis,] with that true Light, which is the Word of God?

CHAP. 37. *How God enlightens every person; God teaches in one way, man in another; the Sun of wisdom shines everywhere, but is not seen by fools.*

The statement, therefore, which occurs in the gospel, "That was the true Light, which lighteth every one that cometh into the world," has this meaning, that no man is illuminated except with that Light of the truth, which is God; so that no person must think that he is enlightened by him whom he listens to as a learner, if that instructor happen to be—I will not say, any great man—but even an angel himself. For the word of truth is applied to man externally by the ministry of a bodily voice, but yet "neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth; but God that giveth the increase."³ Man indeed hears the speaker, be he man or angel, but in order that he may perceive and know that what is said is true, his mind is internally besprinkled with that light which remains for ever, and which shines even in darkness. But just as the sun is not seen by the blind,

¹ John i. 9.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

³ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

though they are clothed as it were with its rays, so is the light of truth not understood by the darkness of folly.

CHAP. 38.

But why, after saying, "which lighteth every one," should he have added, "that cometh into the world,"—the clause which has suggested the opinion that He enlightens the minds of newly-born babes in the recent birth of their bodies from their mother's womb? for the words are so placed in the Greek, that they may be understood to express that the light itself "cometh into the world."¹ If, however, the clause must be taken as a predicate of man ["every one who cometh into the world"], I suppose that it is either a simple phrase, like many others one finds in the Scriptures, which may be removed without impairing the general sense, or else, if it is to be regarded as a distinctive addition, it was probably inserted in order to distinguish spiritual illumination from that bodily one which enlightens the eyes of the flesh either by means of the luminaries of the sky, or by the lights of ordinary fire. He mentioned, therefore, the inner man as coming into the world, because the outward man is of a corporeal nature, just as this worldly fabric is itself; as if he said, "Which lighteth every man on his coming into the body," in accordance with that which is written: "I obtained a good spirit, and I came into a body undefiled."² Or again, if the passage, "Which lighteth every one that cometh into the world," was added for the sake of expressing some distinction, it might perhaps mean: Which illuminates every inner man, because, when the inner man becomes truly wise, it is enlightened only by Him who is the true Light; or, once more, if the intention was to designate reason herself, which causes the human soul to be called rational (and which faculty, although as yet quiet and as it were asleep, is for all that latent in infants, sown and implanted in their nature), by the term *illumination*, as if it were the creation of the eye within, then it cannot be denied that it is made when the soul is created; and there is no absurdity in supposing this to take place when the human

¹ "Ο [scil. τὸ φῶς] φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

² Wisd. viii. 19, 20.

being comes into the world. But yet, although his eye is now created, he himself must needs remain in darkness, if he does not believe in Him who said: "I am come a Light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness."¹ Now that this takes place in the case of infants, through the sacrament of baptism, is not doubted by our mother the Church, which uses for them the heart and mouth of a mother, that they may be imbued with the sacred mysteries, seeing that they have not themselves as yet a heart for "believing unto righteousness," nor a mouth of their own to make "confession unto salvation."² There is not indeed a man among the faithful, who would hesitate to call such infants *believers* merely from the circumstance that such a designation is derived from the act of believing; for although incapable of such an act themselves, yet others are sponsors for them in the sacraments.

CHAP. 39. [XXVI.]—*The conclusion drawn, that all are involved in original sin.*

It would be tedious, were we fully to discuss, at similar length, every testimony bearing on the question. I suppose it will be the more convenient course simply to collect the passages together which may turn up, or such as shall seem suitable for manifesting the truth, that the Lord Jesus Christ came in the flesh, and, in the form of a servant, became obedient even to the death of the cross,³ for no other reason than (by this dispensation of His most merciful grace) to give life to all those who are engrafted members of His body, and to whom accordingly He becomes their Head for their gaining possession of the kingdom of heaven; and furthermore to save, free, redeem, and enlighten them, involved as they had aforetime been in the death of sin, exposed to its infirmities, thralldom, captivity, and darkness, under the dominion of the devil, the author of sin; that He might thus become the Mediator between God and man, and that by Him (after the enmity of our ungodly condition had been terminated by His gracious help) we might be reconciled to God unto eternal life, having been rescued from the everlasting death which threatened such as us. When this shall have been made

¹ John xii. 46.

² Rom. x. 10.

³ Phil. ii. 8.

clear by more than sufficient evidence, it will follow that those persons can have no possible connection with that dispensation of Christ which is comprised in His humiliation, who have no need of life, and salvation, and deliverance, and redemption, and illumination. And inasmuch as this dispensation has [for one of its instruments] the baptism in which we are buried with Christ, in order to be incorporated into Him as His members (that is, as those who believe in Him), it must of course be inferred that baptism is unnecessary for them, who have no need of the benefit of that forgiveness and reconciliation which is acquired through a Mediator. Now, seeing that they admit the necessity of baptizing infants,—finding themselves unable to contravene that authority of the universal Church, which has been unquestionably handed down by the Lord and His apostles,—they cannot avoid the further concession, that infants require the same benefits of the Mediator, in order that, being washed by the sacrament and charity of the faithful, and thereby incorporated into the body of Christ, which is the Church, they may be reconciled to God, and so live in Him, and be saved, and delivered, and redeemed, and enlightened; but [saved and delivered] from what, if not from death, and the vices, and guilt, and thralldom, and darkness of sin? Now, inasmuch as there cannot be committed any of these in the tender age of infancy by any actual transgression, it follows that original sin [must be inherent in infants].

CHAP. 40. [XXVII.]—*A collection of Scripture testimonies.*

This reasoning will carry more weight, after I have collected the mass of Scripture testimonies which I have undertaken to adduce. We have already quoted: "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."¹ To the same purport [the Lord] says, on entering the home of Zaccheus: "To-day is salvation come to this house, forso much as he also is a son of Abraham; for the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."² The same truth is declared in the parable of the lost sheep and the ninety and nine which were left until the missing one was sought and found;³ as it is

¹ Luke v. 32.

² Luke xix. 9.

³ Luke xv. 4.

also in the parable of the lost one among the ten silver coins.¹ Whence, as He said, "it behoved that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."² Mark likewise, at the end of his Gospel, tells us how that the Lord said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."³ Now, who can be unaware that in the case of infants being baptized is to believe, and not being baptized is not to believe? From the Gospel of John we have already adduced some passages. However, I must also request your attention to the following: John Baptist says of Christ, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world;"⁴ and He too says of Himself, "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish."⁵ Now, inasmuch as infants are only able to become His sheep by baptism, it must needs come to pass that they perish if they are not baptized, because they will not have that eternal life which He gives to His sheep. So in another passage He says: "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father, but by me."⁶

CHAP. 41.

See with what earnestness the apostles declare this doctrine, after they had once received it. Peter, in his first Epistle, says: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to His abundant mercy, hath regenerated us unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the last time."⁷ And a little afterwards he adds: "May ye be found unto the praise and honour of Jesus Christ: of whom ye were ignorant; but in whom ye believe, though now ye see Him not; and in

¹ Luke xv. 8.² Luke xxiv. 46, 47.³ Mark xvi. 15, 16.⁴ John i. 29.⁵ John x. 27, 28.⁶ John xiv. 6.⁷ 1 Pet. i. 3-5.

whom also ye shall rejoice, when ye shall see Him, with joy unspeakable and full of glory: receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls."¹ Again, in another place he says: "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people; that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."² Once more he says: "Christ hath once suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God;"³ and, after mentioning the fact of eight persons having been saved in Noah's ark, he adds: "And by the like figure baptism saveth you."⁴ Now infants are strangers to this salvation and light, and will remain in perdition and darkness, unless they are joined to the people of God by adoption, holding that Christ suffered the just for the unjust, to bring them unto God.

CHAP. 42.

Moreover, from John's Epistle I meet with the following words, which seem indispensable to the solution of this question: "But if," says he, "we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin."⁵ To the like import he says, in another place: "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God which He hath testified of His Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself: he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son. And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life; and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."⁶ It seems, then, that it is not only the kingdom of heaven, but life also, which infants are not to have, if they have not the Son, whom they can only have by His baptism. So again he says: "For this cause the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil."⁷ Therefore infants will have no interest in the manifestation of the Son of God, if He do not in them destroy the works of the devil.

¹ 1 Pet. i. 7-9.

² 1 Pet. ii. 9.

³ 1 Pet. iii. 18.

⁴ 1 Pet. iii. 21.

⁵ 1 John i. 7.

⁶ 1 John v. 9-12.

⁷ 1 John iii. 8.

CHAP. 43.—*Paul was an earnest preacher of the grace of God.*

Let me now request your attention to the testimony of the Apostle Paul on this subject. And quotations from him may of course be made more abundantly, because he wrote more epistles, and because it fell to him to recommend the grace of God with especial earnestness, in opposition to those who gloried in their works, and who, ignorant of God's righteousness, and wishing to establish their own, submitted not to the righteousness of God.¹ In his Epistle to the Romans he writes: "The righteousness of God is upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; since all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time His righteousness; that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."² Then in another passage he says: "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth no sin."³ And then after no long interval he observes: "Now, it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on Him that raised up Jesus Christ our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."⁴ Then a little after he writes: "For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly."⁵ In another passage he says: "We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I know not: for what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do. If then I do that which I would

¹ Rom. x. 3.

² Rom. iii. 22-26.

³ Rom. iv. 4-8.

⁴ Rom. iv. 23-25.

⁵ Rom. v. 6.

not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing; for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”¹ Let them, who can, say that men are not born in this body of death, that so they may be able to affirm that they have no need of God’s grace through Jesus Christ in order to be delivered from the body of this death. Therefore he adds, a few verses afterwards: “For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh.”² Let them say, who dare, that Christ must have been born in the likeness of sinful flesh, if we were not born in sinful flesh.

СНАР. 44.

Likewise to the Corinthians he says: “For I delivered to you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.”³ Again, in his Second Epistle to these Corinthians: “For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if One died for all, then were all dead: and for all did Christ die, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him which died for them, and rose again. Wherefore, henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet from henceforth know we Him so no more. Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things

¹ Rom. vii. 14-25.

² Rom. viii. 3.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 3.

are become new. And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation. To what effect? That God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and putting on us the ministry of reconciliation. Now then are we ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God. For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might become the righteousness of God in Him.¹ We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain. (For He saith, I have heard thee in an acceptable time, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the acceptable time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)² Now, if infants are not embraced within this reconciliation and salvation, who wants them for the baptism of Christ? But if they are embraced [in this reconciliation and salvation,] then are they reckoned as among the dead for whom He died; nor can they be possibly reconciled and saved by Him, unless He remit and impute not unto them their sins.

CHAP. 45.

Likewise to the Galatians the apostle writes: "Grace be to you, and peace, from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave Himself for our sins, that He might deliver us from this present evil world."³ While in another passage he says to them: "The law was added because of transgressions, until the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator belongs not to one party; but God is one. Is the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe."⁴

CHAP. 46.

To the Ephesians he addresses words of the same import:

¹ 2 Cor. v. 14-21. ² 2 Cor. vi. 1, 2. ³ Gal. i. 3. ⁴ Gal. iii. 19-22.

“ And you [hath He quickened,] when ye were dead in trespasses and sins ; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience ; among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind ; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others. But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ ; by whose grace ye are saved.”¹ Again, a little afterwards, he says : “ By grace are ye saved through faith ; and that not of yourselves : it is the gift of God : not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.”² And again, after a short interval : “ At that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world : but now, in Christ Jesus, ye who were sometimes far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us ; having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances ; for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace ; and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having in Himself slain the enmity ; and He came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through Him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.”³ Then in another passage he thus writes : “ As the truth is in Jesus : that ye put off, concerning the former conversation, the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts ; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind ; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.”⁴ And again : “ Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.”⁵

¹ Eph. ii. 1-5.² Eph. ii. 8-10.³ Eph. ii. 12-18.⁴ Eph. iv. 22-24.⁵ Eph. iv. 30.

CHAP. 47.

To the Colossians he addresses these words: "Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light: who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son; in whom we have redemption in the remission of our sins."¹ And again he says: "And ye are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead. And you, when ye were dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to His cross; and putting the flesh off Him,"² He made a bold and confident show of principalities and powers, triumphing over them in Himself."³

CHAP. 48.

And then to Timothy he says: "This is a faithful saying,⁴ and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting."⁵ He also says: "For there is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all."⁶ In his second Epistle to the same Timothy, he says: "Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me His prisoner: but be thou a fellow-labourer for the gospel, according to the power of God; who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the

¹ Col. i. 12-14.² Exuens se carnem.³ Col. ii. 10-15.⁴ Humanus sermo.⁵ 1 Tim. i. 15, 16.⁶ 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

world began; but is now manifested by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.”¹

CHAP. 49.

Then again he writes to Titus as follows: “Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”² And to the like effect in another passage: “But after that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that, being justified by His grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.”³

CHAP. 50.

The Epistle of the Hebrews, although its authority is doubted by some,⁴ is, I find, sometimes held by persons, who oppose our opinion touching the baptism of infants, to contain evidence in favour of their own views. We are therefore bound to notice the pointed testimony it bears in our behalf; and I quote it the more confidently, because of the authority of the Eastern Churches, which expressly place it amongst the canonical Scriptures. In its very exordium one thus reads: “God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken to us by His Son, whom He hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also He made the worlds; who, being

¹ 2 Tim. i. 8-10.² Tit. ii. 13, 14.³ Tit. iii. 3-7.

⁴ Amongst the Latins, as Jerome tells us in more than one passage (see his *Commentaries*, on Isa. vi., viii.; on Zech. viii.; on Matt. xxvi.; also, in his *Catal. Script. Eccles.*, c. xvi. [ad Paulum], and lxx. [ad Gaium], etc.). The Greeks, however, held that the epistle was the work of St. Paul. In his *Epistle* cxxix. [ad Dardanum] he thus writes: “We must admit that the epistle written to the Hebrews is regarded as the Apostle Paul’s, not only by the churches of the East, but by all church writers who have from the beginning (*retro*) written in Greek.”—[NOTE OF THE BENEDICTINE EDITOR.]

the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."¹ And by and by the writer says: "For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward, how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?"² And again in another passage: "Forasmuch then," says he, "as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage."³ Again, shortly after, he says: "Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren, that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people."⁴ And in another place he writes: "Let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."⁵ Again he says: "He hath an unchangeable priesthood. Wherefore He is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by Him, seeing He ever liveth to make intercession for them. For such a High Priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily (as those high priests) to offer up sacrifice, first for His own sins, and then for the people's: for this He did once, when He offered up Himself."⁶ And once more: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; (for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world;) but now once, in the end of the world, hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. And as it

¹ Heb. i. 1-3.² Heb. ii. 2, 3.³ Heb. ii. 14, 15.⁴ Heb. ii. 17.⁵ Heb. iv. 14, 15.⁶ Heb. vii. 24-27.

is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation."¹

CHAP. 51.

The Revelation of John likewise tells us that in a new song these praises are offered to Christ: "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation."²

CHAP. 52.

To the like effect, in the Acts of the Apostles, the Apostle Peter designated the Lord Jesus as "the Prince or Author of life," upbraiding the Jews for having put Him to death in these words: "But ye dishonoured and denied the Holy One and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you, and ye killed the Prince of life."³ While in another passage he says: "This is the stone which was set at nought by you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."⁴ And again, elsewhere: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, by hanging on a tree. Him hath God exalted with His right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins."⁵ Once more [the same apostle says:] "To Him give all the prophets witness, that, through His name, whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins."⁶ Whilst in the same Acts of the Apostles Paul says: "Be it known therefore unto you, men and brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by Him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."⁷

CHAP. 53.—*The utility of the books of the Old Testament.*

Under so great a weight of testimony, who would not be oppressed that should dare lift up his voice against the truth

¹ Heb. ix. 24-28.² Rev. v. 9.³ Acts iii. 14, 15.⁴ Acts iv. 11, 12.⁵ Acts v. 30, 31.⁶ Acts x. 43.⁷ Acts xiii. 38, 39.

of God? And many other testimonies might be found, were it not for my anxiety to bring this tract to an end,—an anxiety which I must not slight. From the books of the Old Testament, likewise, many attestations to our doctrine in inspired words [might be adduced, but these] I have deemed it superfluous to quote, on the ground that what they have concealed under the veil of earthly promises is clearly revealed in the preaching of the New Testament. Our Lord Himself briefly demonstrated and defined the use of the Old Testament writings, when He said that it was necessary there should be a fulfilment of what had been written concerning Himself in the Law, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, even to the effect that Christ must suffer, and rise from the dead the third day, and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.¹ In agreement with which is that statement of Peter which I have already quoted, how that all the prophets bear witness to Christ, through whose means every one that believes in Him receives remission of his sins.²

CHAP. 54.—*By the sacrifices of the Old Testament men were convinced of sins rather than cleansed from them.*

And yet it is perhaps better to advance a few testimonies even out of the Old Testament, which will serve to supplement our former quotations, or rather form a crowning addition to their value. The Lord Himself, speaking by the Psalmist, says: “As for my saints which are upon earth, He hath wonderfully fulfilled all my purposes in them.”³ He does not say *their merits*, but “*my purposes*.” For what is theirs except that which is afterwards mentioned,—“their sorrows are multiplied,”⁴—proving the fact that they are weak? Wherefore also the law entered, that the offence might abound. But why does the Psalmist immediately add: “They hastened after another?”⁵ When their sorrows and infirmities multiplied (that is, when their offence abounded), they then sought the Physician with the greater eagerness, that so, where sin abounded, grace might much more abound. He then says: “I will not gather their assemblies together [with their offerings] of blood;”

¹ See Luke xxiv. 44-47.

² Acts x. 43.

³ Ps. xvi. 3 (Sept.).

⁴ Ps. xvi. 4.

⁵ Ps. xvi. 4.

for by their many sacrifices of blood, when they gathered their assemblies into the tabernacle at first, and then into the temple, they were rather convicted as sinners than cleansed. I shall not then gather these assemblies of blood-offerings together, He says in fact; because there is one blood-shedding given for many, whereby they may be cleansed in very deed. Then it follows, [in the same verse:] "Neither will I make mention of their names with my lips." For these were their names at first: children of the flesh, children of the world, children of wrath, children of the devil, unclean, sinners, impious; but afterwards they became children of God,—becoming a new man, a new name befits them; and a new song, because endued with new chanting powers by means of the New Testament [of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ]. Men must not be ungracious with God's grace, mean and small with great things; [but be ever rising] from the less to the greater. The cry of the whole Church is, "I have gone astray like a lost sheep."¹ From all the members of Christ the voice is heard: "All we, as sheep, have gone astray; and He hath Himself been delivered up for our sins."² The whole of this passage is that famous one in Isaiah which was expounded by Philip to the eunuch of Queen Candace, when he on the strength of it believed in Jesus.³ See how often he commends this very subject, and, as it were, inculcates it again and again on proud and contentious men: "He was a man under a heavy stroke, who well knew how to bear infirmities; because His face was averted, dishonoured, and lightly esteemed. He carries our sins, and for us is involved in pains: and we accounted Him to be [for Himself] in pain, and suffering, and punishment. But He was wounded for our sins, was weakened for our infirmities; it was our peace's chastisement that was inflicted on Him; and by His bruise we are healed. All we, as sheep, have gone astray; and the Lord delivered Him up for our sins. And although He was Himself so evilly treated, He yet opened not His mouth: as a sheep was He led to the slaughter, and as a lamb is dumb before the shearer, so He opened not His mouth. In His humiliation His judgment was taken away: His generation who shall declare? For His

¹ Ps. cxix. 176.² Isa. liii. 6.³ Acts viii. 30-37.

life shall be taken away from the earth, and for the iniquities of my people was He led to death. Therefore I will give the wicked for His burial, and the rich for His death; because He did no iniquity, nor deceit with His mouth. The Lord is pleased to purge Him from His stroke. If you could yourselves have given your soul an offering for sin, then ye should certainly see a seed of a prolonged life. The Lord is also pleased to rescue His soul from its travail, to show Him light, and to form it through His understanding; to justify the Just One, who serves so well the cause of many; and He shall Himself bear their sins. Therefore for His inheritance He shall possess many, and He shall divide the spoils of the mighty; and He was numbered amongst the transgressors; and Himself bare the sins of many, and for their iniquities was He delivered.”¹ Consider also that passage of this same prophet which Christ actually declared to be fulfilled in Himself, when He recited it in the synagogue [of Nazareth], discharging the function of the reader:² “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He hath anointed me: to preach glad tidings to the poor hath He sent me; (that so I may refresh all who are broken-hearted,) as well as to preach deliverance to the captives, and to the blind recovery of their sight.”³ Let us then all acknowledge Him; nor should there be one exception among persons like ourselves, who wish to cleave to His body, to enter through Him into the sheepfold, and to attain to that salvation and eternal life which He has promised to His own.—Let us, I repeat, all of us acknowledge Him who did no sin, who bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we might live unto righteousness separate from sins; by whose wounds and scars we are healed, although in ourselves so weak—as erring sheep.⁴

CHAP. 55. [XXVIII.]—*He concludes that all men need the death of Christ, that they may be saved. Unbaptized infants will be involved in the condemnation of the devil. How all men through Adam are unto condemnation; and through Christ unto justification.*

Under such circumstances, no man of those who have been joined to Christ by baptism has ever been regarded, according to sound doctrine and the true faith, as excepted from the

¹ Isa. liii. 3–12 (Sept.).

² See Luke iv. 16–21.

³ Isa. lxi. 1.

⁴ There is here some omission.—BENEDICTINE NOTE.

grace of forgiveness of sins; nor has eternal life been ever thought possible to any man except in Christ's kingdom. For this [eternal life] is ready to be revealed at the last time,¹ which will be at the resurrection of the dead who are reserved not for that eternal death which is called "the second death," but for the eternal life which God, who cannot lie, promises to His saints and faithful servants. Now all who shall partake of this life can only be made alive in Christ, even as all die in Adam.² For as none whatever, in respect of their birth according to the will of the flesh, die except in Adam, in whom they all sinned, so none at all who are regenerated by the will of the Spirit are endowed with life except in Christ, in whom they are all justified. Because as through one all [are brought] to condemnation, so through One are all [brought] to justification. Nor is there any middle place or state for any man, so that a man can only be with the devil who is not with Christ. Accordingly, even the Lord Himself (wishing to remove from the minds of heretical thinkers³ that vague and indefinite middle condition, which some would provide for unbaptized infants,—as if, by reason of their innocence, they were embraced in eternal life, but were not, because of their unbaptized state, with Christ in His kingdom) uttered that definitive sentence of His, which seems intended to shut the mouths of these persons: "He that is not with me is against me."⁴ Take then the case of any infant you please: If he is already in Christ, why baptize him? If, however, as the Truth puts the case, he is baptized for the express purpose of being with Christ, it certainly follows that he who is not baptized is not with Christ; and if he is not "with" Christ, he is "against" Christ; for He has pronounced His own sentence, which is so explicit that we ought not, and indeed cannot, impair it or change it. And how can *he* be "against" Christ, if not owing to sin? for it cannot possibly be from his soul or his body, both of these being the creation of God. Now if it be owing to sin, what sin can be found at such an age, except the ancient and original sin? Of course that sinful flesh in which all are born to condemnation is one thing, and that Flesh which was made "after the likeness of sinful flesh,"

¹ 1 Pet. i. 5.² 1 Cor. xv. 22.³ *Malè credentium.*⁴ Matt. xii. 30.

whereby also all are freed from condemnation, is another thing. It is, however, by no means meant to be implied that all who are born in sinful flesh are themselves actually cleansed by that Flesh, which is "like" sinful flesh; "for all men have not faith."¹ [What is meant is, to predicate such a universal sense in each case as shall be compatible with their respective conditions, so that] all who spring from natural concubinage are born entirely of sinful flesh, whilst all who are born again of spiritual betrothal are cleansed only by the Flesh which is in the likeness of sinful flesh. In other words, the former class are in Adam [born] to condemnation, the latter are in Christ [regenerated] to justification. This is pretty much the same thing as saying, for example, that in such a city there is a certain widow who undertakes for all; and in the same place there is an expert teacher who instructs the entire community. [Now in these modes of expression there is of course a limitation.] In the one case, only those who are born can possibly be understood; in the other case, only those who are taught: it does not, however, follow that all who are born also receive the instruction. For it is obvious to any that the former statement, about her undertaking for all, indicates that none is born without passing through her hands; while the other assertion, about his teaching all, implies that none is instructed except by his tuition.

CHAP. 56.—*No one is reconciled to God except through Christ.*

Taking into account all the inspired statements which I have quoted,—whether I regard the separate value of each passage, or combine their united testimony in an accumulated witness (or if I even include similar passages which I have not adduced),—there can be nothing discovered, but that which the Catholic Church holds, in her dutiful vigilance against all profane novelties, that every man is separated from God, except those who are reconciled to Him through Christ the Mediator; and that no one can be separated from God, except through the sins which cause separation: that there is, therefore, no reconciliation except by the remission of sins, through the grace alone of the most merciful Saviour,—through

¹ 2 Thess. iii. 2.

the only sacrifice of the most veritable Priest; and that none who are born of the woman, that trusted the serpent and was corrupted through concupiscence,¹ are delivered from this body of death, except by the Son of the virgin who believed the angel so as to be impregnated without concupiscence.²

CHAP. 57. [XXIX].—*The good of marriage; original sin seems to stand in sexual love; four different cases of the good and the evil use of matrimony.*

The good, then, of marriage lies not in the ardour of concupiscence, but in a certain legitimate and honourable means of indulging the ardour, adapted for the propagation of children, not for the gratification of lust. [What characterizes matrimony is the regulated desire—*voluntas*—not the voluptuous extravagance—*voluptas*.]³ That, therefore, which is recklessly excited in the members of this body of death, and endeavours to attract into itself the entire affection of our fallen state (neither arising nor subsiding at the bidding of the mind), is that evil of sin in which every man is born. When, however, it curbs its unlawful and corrupt desires, and applies itself simply to the temperate propagation and renewal of the human race, then ensues the proper use of wedlock, which produces human birth by the well-ordered conjunction of the sexes. Nobody, however, is born again in Christ's body, unless he be previously born in the body of sin. But inasmuch as it is an evil to make a bad use of a good thing, so is it a good to utilize a bad thing well. These two ideas therefore of *good* and *evil*, and those other two of a *good use* and an *evil use*, when they are duly combined together, produce four different conditions:—[1.] A man makes a good use of a good thing, when he dedicates his chastity to God; [2.] He makes a bad use of a good thing, when he dedicates his chastity to an idol; [3.] He makes a bad use of an evil thing, when he loosely gratifies his concupiscence by adultery; [4.] He makes a good use of an evil thing, when he restrains his concupiscence by matrimony. Now, as it is better to make good use of a good thing than to make good use of an evil thing,—the use in both instances being good,—so “he that giveth his virgin in marriage doeth well; but he that

¹ Gen. iii. 6.

² Luke i. 38.

³ The sentence between the brackets occurs in none of the mss.

giveth her not in marriage doeth better.”¹ This question, indeed, I have treated at greater length, and more to the point, as God enabled me according to my humble abilities, in two works of mine,—one of them, *On the Good of Marriage*, and the other, *On Holy Virginity*. They, therefore, who extol the flesh and blood of a sinful creature, to the prejudice of the Redeemer’s flesh and blood, must not defend the evil of concupiscence through the good of marriage; nor should they, from whose infant age the Lord has inculcated in us a lesson of humility,² be proudly exalted by the error of others. He only was born without sin whom His virgin mother conceived without the embrace of a husband,—not by the concupiscence of the flesh, but by the chaste submission of her mind.³ She alone was able to give birth to One who should heal our wound, who brought forth the germ of a pure offspring without the wound of sin.

CHAP. 58. [XXX.]—*In what respect the Pelagians regarded baptism as necessary for infants.*

Let us now examine more carefully, so far as the Lord enables us, that very chapter of the Gospel where He says, “Except a man be born again,—of water and the Spirit,—he shall not enter into the kingdom of God.”⁴ If it were not for the authority which this sentence has with them, they would not be of opinion that infants ought to be baptized at all. This is their comment on the passage: “Because He does not say, ‘Except a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he shall not have salvation or eternal life,’ but He merely said, ‘shall not enter into the kingdom of God,’ therefore infants are to be baptized, to the intent that they may be with Christ in the kingdom of God, where they will not find entrance unless they are baptized. Should they die, however, even without baptism, in the state of infancy, they will have salvation and eternal life, seeing that they are not bound with any chain of sin.” Now in such a statement as this, the first thing that strikes one is, that they never explain *where the justice is* of separating from the kingdom of God that “image of God” which has no sin. Then, secondly, we ought to see whether the Lord Jesus, the one only true

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 38.

² Matt. xviii. 4.

³ Luke i. 34, 35.

⁴ John iii. 3, 5.

Teacher, has not in this very passage of the Gospel intimated, and indeed shown us, that it only comes to pass through the forgiveness of their sins that baptized persons reach the kingdom of God; although to persons of a right understanding, the words, as they stand in the passage, ought to be sufficiently explicit: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;"¹ and: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."² For why should he be born again, unless to be renewed? From what is he to be renewed, if not from some old condition? From what old condition, but that in which "our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed?"³ Or whence comes it to pass that "the image of God" enters not into the kingdom of God, unless it be that the impediment of sin prevents it? However, let us (as we said before) see, as earnestly and diligently as we are able, what is the entire context which belongs to the quotation which we have made out of the Gospel on the point in question.

CHAP. 59.

"There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews: the same came to Jesus by night, and said unto Him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto Him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit. Nicodemus answered and said unto Him, How can these

¹ John iii. 3.² John iii. 5.³ Rom. vi. 6.

things be? Jesus answered and said unto him, Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; and ye receive not our witness. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness,¹ even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved. He that believeth on Him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd. But he that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God."² Thus far the Lord's discourse wholly relates to the subject of our present inquiry; from this point the sacred historian digresses to another matter.

CHAP. 60. [XXXI.]—*Christ, the head and the body; owing to the union of the natures in the person of Christ, He both remained in heaven, and walked about on earth; how the one Christ could ascend to heaven; the one Christ is not only the head, but the body too.*

Now when Nicodemus understood not what was being told him, he inquired of the Lord how such things could possibly be. Let us look at what the Lord said to him in answer to his inquiry; for of course, as He deigns to answer the question how these things can be, He will in fact tell us how spiritual regeneration can accrue to a man who springs from carnal generation. After noticing with a slight censure the ignorance

¹ Num. xxi. 9.

² John iii. 1-21.

of one who assumed a superiority over others as being a public teacher, and having blamed the unbelief of all persons who belonged to his class, for refusing to accept His witness to the truth, He went on to inquire and wonder whether, as He had told them about earthly things and had not gained their assent, they would believe Him when He discoursed about heavenly things. He then pursues the subject, and gives an answer such as others should believe—if these refused—to His own question, [and so indicates] how these mysteries could happen. “No man,” says He, “hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.”¹ Thus, He says in fact, shall happen the spiritual birth,—men, from being earthly, becoming heavenly; and this result they can only obtain [so He seems to add] by being made members of me; so that he may ascend who descended,—no one ascending unless he first descended. All, therefore, who have to be changed and raised must meet together in a union with Christ, so that the Christ who descended should Himself ascend, reckoning His body (that is to say, His Church) as nothing else than Himself,—that passage receiving its truest sense from Christ and the Church, “And they twain shall be one flesh;”² concerning which very subject He expressly said Himself, “So then they are no more twain, but one flesh.”³ To ascend, therefore, they would be wholly unable [out of Christ], since “no man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.”⁴ For although, as the Son of man, He was formed on earth, yet He did not deem it unworthy of that divinity, in which, while remaining in heaven, He came down to earth, to designate it by the name of the Son of man, as He dignified His flesh with the name of Son of God (thereby to prevent His two conditions being regarded as two Christs,—the one God, the other man; ⁵ and to secure His being at once both God and man,—God, because “in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and

¹ John iii. 13.

³ Mark x. 8.

² Gen. ii. 24.

⁴ John iii. 13.

⁵ This was the error which was subsequently condemned in the heresy of Nestorius.

the Word was God ;”¹ and man, inasmuch as “the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us”²). By this means—by the difference between His divinity and His humiliation—He remained in heaven as Son of God, and walked on earth as Son of man ; whilst, by that unity of His person which made His two substances one Christ, He also walked as Son of God on earth, and at the same time Himself remained in heaven as the Son of man. Faith, therefore, in more credible things arises from the belief of such things as are more incredible. For if His divine substance, though a far more distant object, and more sublime, owing to its incomparable diversity [from our human ideas], had ability so to take upon itself the nature of man on our account as to become one Person, and whilst appearing as Son of man on earth in the weakness of the flesh, was able to remain all the while in heaven through the divinity which assumed participation with the flesh, how much easier for our faith is it to suppose that fellow-men, who are His faithful saints, become one Christ with the Man Christ Jesus, so that, whilst all ascend by His grace and fellowship, the one Christ Himself ascends to heaven who came down from heaven ? It is in this sense that the apostle says, “As we have many members in one body, and although all the members of the body, being many, are but one body, so likewise is Christ.”³ He did not say, “So also is Christ’s”—meaning Christ’s body, or Christ’s members—but his words are, “*So likewise is Christ,*” thus calling the one Christ the [Church’s] head and body.

CHAP. 61. [XXXII.]—*The serpent lifted up in the wilderness prefigured Christ suspended on the cross ; even infants themselves poisoned by the serpent’s bite.*

The attainment of this great and wonderful dignity can only be accomplished by the remission of sins. Accordingly He goes on to say, “And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up ; that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life.”⁴ We know what at that time happened in the wilderness. Many were dying of the bite of serpents : the people then confessed their sins, and, through Moses, besought the

¹ John i. 1.² John i. 14.³ 1 Cor. xii. 12.⁴ John iii. 14, 15.

Lord to take away from them the virulent infliction ; accordingly, Moses, at the Lord's command, lifted up a brazen serpent in the desert, and requested every one amongst the people that had been serpent-bitten to look towards the uplifted figure. When they did so they were immediately healed. What means the exalted serpent but the death of Christ, by that mode of expressing a sign, whereby the thing which is effected is signified by him that effects it ? Now death came by the serpent, which persuaded man to commit the sin, owing to which he deserved to die. The Lord, however, transferred not to His own flesh sin, as the poison of the serpent, although He did transfer to it death, that the penalty without the guilt might transpire in the likeness of sinful flesh, whence, in the sinful flesh, both the guilt might be removed and the penalty. As, therefore, it then came to pass that whoever looked at the raised serpent was both healed of the poison and freed from death, so also now, whosoever conforms himself to the likeness of the death of Christ by faith in Him and His baptism, is both liberated from sin by justification, and by resurrection from death. For this is meant when He says, " That whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal life."¹ What necessity then could there be for an infant's being conformed to the death of Christ by baptism, if he were not altogether poisoned by the bite of the serpent ?

CHAP. 62. [XXXIII.]

He then expresses Himself, by way of consequence, to the following effect : " God so loved the world, that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."² Every infant, therefore, was destined to perish, and to lose everlasting life, if through the sacrament of baptism he believed not in the only-begotten Son of God. Meanwhile, He comes not in such a way as to judge the world, but that the world through Him may be saved. This especially appears in the following clause, wherein He says, " He that believeth in Him is not condemned ; although he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten

¹ John iii. 15.

² John iii. 16.

Son of God.”¹ In what class, then, do we place baptized infants but amongst believers, as the voice of the Catholic Church everywhere loudly and clearly asserts? Their rank, therefore, is amongst those who have believed; for this [capacity] accrues to them by virtue of the sacrament and the guarantee of their sponsors, and on this account it follows that such as are not baptized are reckoned among those who have not believed. Now if they who are baptized are not condemned, these last, as not being baptized, are condemned. He adds, indeed: “But this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light.”² Of what does He say, “Light is come into the world,” if not of His own advent? and without the sacrament of His advent, how are infants said to be in the light? And why should we not include even this fact in “men’s love of darkness,” that as they do not themselves believe, so they refuse to think that their infants ought to be baptized, although they are afraid of their incurring the death of the body? “In God,” however, he declares that man’s “works to be wrought, who cometh to the light,”³ because he is quite aware that his justification results from no merits of his own, but from the grace of God. “For it is God,” says the apostle, “who worketh in you both to will and to do of His own good pleasure.”⁴ This then is the way in which spiritual regeneration is effected in all who come to Christ in their carnal state. He explained it Himself, and pointed it out, when He was asked, How those things could be? He left it open to no man to settle such a question by human reasoning. There is no passage leading to Christ, no man can be reconciled to God, or can come to God, except through Christ.

CHAP. 63. [XXXIV.]—*The form, or rite, of baptism. Exorcism.*

What shall I say of the actual form of baptism? I only wish some one of those who espouse the contrary side would bring me an infant to be baptized. What does my exorcism do in that babe, if he be not firmly included in the devil’s family? The man who brought the infant would certainly have had to act as sponsor for him, for he could not answer for

¹ John iii. 18.

² John iii. 19.

³ John iii. 21.

⁴ Phil. ii. 13.

himself. How was it possible then for him to declare that he renounced the devil, if there was no devil in him? that he was converted to God, if he had never been averted from Him? that he believed, besides other articles, in the forgiveness of sins, if no sins were attributable to him? For my own part, indeed, if I thought that his opinions were opposed to this faith, I could not permit him even to bring the infant to the sacraments. Nor can I imagine with what face before men, or what mind before God, he can conduct himself in such a way. But I do not wish to say anything too severe. That a false and fallacious form of baptism should be administered to infants, in which there might be the sound and semblance of something being done, but yet no remission of sins actually ensue, has been seen and allowed by some amongst them to be as abominable and hateful a thing as it was possible to mention or conceive. Then, again, in respect of the necessity of baptism to infants, they admit that even infants stand in need of redemption,—a concession which is made in a short treatise written by one of their party,—but yet there is not found in this work any open admission of the forgiveness of a single sin. According, however, to an intimation dropped in your letter to me, they now acknowledge, as you say, that a remission of sins takes place even in infants through baptism. No wonder; for it is impossible that *redemption* should be understood in any other way. Their own words are these: “It is, however, not by reason of their original condition, but in their own proper actual life, after their birth, that they began to commit sin.

CHAP. 64.—*A twofold mistake respecting infants.*

You see how great a difference there is amongst those whom I have been opposing at such length and persistency in this work,—one of whom has written the book which contains the points I have refuted to the best of my ability. You see, as I was saying, the important difference existing between such of them as maintain that infants are absolutely pure and free from all sin, whether original or actual; and those who suppose that from their very birth infants have contracted sins of their own, from which they need cleansing by baptism.

The latter class, indeed, by examining the Scriptures, and considering the authority of the whole Church as well as the form of the sacrament itself, have clearly discovered that by baptism remission of sins accrues to infants; but they are either unable or unwilling to allow that the sin which infants have is original sin. The former class, however, clearly observed (as they easily might) that in the very nature of man, which is open to the consideration of all men, the tender age of which we speak could not possibly commit any sin whatever in its own proper conduct; but, to avoid acknowledging original sin, they assert that in infants there is no sin at all. Now in the truths which they thus severally maintain, it so happens that they first of all mutually agree with each other, and subsequently differ from us in no material aspect. For if the one party concede to the other that remission of sins takes place in all infants which are baptized, whilst the other concedes to their opponents that infants (as infant-nature itself in the stillness of its silence even loudly proclaims) have as yet contracted no sin in their own living, then both sides must agree in conceding to us, that nothing remains but original sin, which can be remitted in baptism.

CHAP. 65. [xxxv.]—*In infants there are no sins actually committed by them.*

Will this point also be questioned, and must we spend any time in discussing it, [namely,] to prove and show how that by their own will—without which there can be no sin actually committed—infants could never commit an offence, whom all, for this very reason, are in the habit of calling *innocent*? Does not their great weakness of mind and body, their perfect ignorance of things, their utter inability to obey a precept, the absence in them of all perception and impression of either natural or written law, the complete want of reason—to impel them in the direction either of right or of wrong,—[does not, I say, each one of these conditions of their life] proclaim and demonstrate the point before us by its silent and negative testimony much more expressively than any argument of ours? The very palpableness of the fact must surely go a great way to persuade us of its truth; for there is no place where I do

not find traces of what I say, so ubiquitous is the fact of which we are speaking,—clearer, indeed, to perceive than anything we can say to prove it.

CHAP. 66.—*Infants' faults spring from their sheer ignorance ; their pranks, like those of simpletons, afford a natural pleasure and amusement.*

I should, however, wish any one who was wise on the point to tell me what sin he has seen or thought of in an infant fresh from its mother's womb, for redemption from which he allows baptism to be already necessary ; or how much evil it has at this period of its life committed in its own mind or body. If it should happen to cry and to be tedious to its elders, I wonder whether my informant would ascribe this to the fault of the baby, and not rather to its infelicity. What, too, would he say to the fact that it is hushed from its very weeping by no appeal to its own reason, and by no prohibition of any one else ? This, however, comes from the ignorance in which it is so deeply steeped, by reason of which, too, when it grows stronger, as it very soon does, it strikes its mother in its little passion, and often her very breasts which it sucks in its desire for food. Well, now, these small freaks are not only borne in very young children, but are actually liked,—and this, too, with an affection which is only natural,¹ such as will feel pleasure from a laugh or a joke, even when seasoned with fun and nonsense by clever persons ; indeed, if the said joke were only felt in the way mentioned, the persons who indulge therein would not be laughed with as facetious, but derided as simpletons. Talking, indeed, of simpletons, we see how the silly fools called *Moriones*² are used for the amusement of clever people ; and that they fetch higher prices than your clever folks when appraised for the slave market. So great, then, is the influence of mere natural feeling, and *that* on persons who are by no means fools, in producing amusement at another's misfortune. Now, although a man may be amused by another man's silliness, he would still dislike to be a simpleton himself ; and if the father, who gladly enough looks out for, and even provokes, silly pranks from his own merry little boy, were to foreknow that he would, when grown

¹ Carnali.

² See above, chap. 32.

up, turn out a mere ninny, he would no doubt think him a cause of a bitterer sorrow than if he lost him by death. So long, however, as there is a good hope of healthy faculties, and a belief that a clear intellect will come with increase of years, then it often happens that the saucy pranks of young children even on father and mother are thought not merely not wrong, but even agreeable and pleasant. No prudent man could possibly approve of a weakness, which not only fails, while prohibition is possible, to forbid in children such conduct in word and deed as this, but even excites them to it, that they may enjoy the fun, and gratify the folly of their elders. For as soon as children are of an age to know their father and mother, they dare not use wrong words to either, unless permitted or bidden by either, or both; and even this can only be in the case of such young children as are now striving to lisp out words, and whose minds are just able to give motion to their tongue in such words as you please. Let us, however, consider rather that most perfect ignorance of newborn babes, out of which, as they advance in age, they come to that merely temporary period of stuttering folly and prattle,—on their road, as it were, to full knowledge and speech.

CHAP. 67. [XXXVI.]—*On the ignorance of infants, and whence it arises.*

Yes, let us consider that darkness of their rational intellect, by reason of which they are even completely ignorant of God, whose sacraments they actually struggle against, while being baptized. Now my inquiry is, When and whence came they to be immersed in this darkness? Is it then the fact that they incurred it all *here*, and in this life and conduct of theirs forgot God through over-much negligence, after a life of wisdom and religion in their mother's womb? Let those say so who dare; let them listen to [the nonsense] who like it; let them believe it who can. I, however, am sure that none whose minds are not blinded by an obstinate adherence to a foregone conclusion can possibly entertain such an opinion. Is there then no evil in ignorance,—nothing in it which needs to be purged and done away? What means that prayer: "Remember not the sins of my youth and of my ignorance?"¹

¹ Ps. xxiv. 7 (Sept.).

For although those sins are more damnable which are knowingly committed, yet if there were no sins of ignorance, we should not have read in Scripture such a sentence as entreats God not to remember the sins of one's youth and one's ignorance. Seeing now that the soul of an infant fresh from its mother's womb is still the soul of a human being,—nay, the soul of a rational creature,—and remembering that it is not only untaught, but even incapable of instruction, I ask why, or when, or whence, it was plunged into the shadows of that thick darkness in which it lies? If it is the way of man's nature thus to begin its course, and if that nature is not at fault in this early stage, then why was not Adam created with such a nature? Why was *he* susceptible of a moral commandment? and how had he intellectual ability to give names to his wife, and to all the animal creation? For of her he said, "She shall be called Woman;"¹ and in respect of the rest we read: "Whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."² Whereas the human being of whom we write, although *he* is ignorant where he is, what he is, by whom created, of what parents born, is already guilty of offence, and yet is incapable as yet of moral government, and is so completely involved and overwhelmed in a cloud of darkness and ignorance, that he cannot be aroused out of his sleepy condition, so as to perceive that these facts are at any rate set before him; but a time must be patiently awaited, until he can shake off this overhanging drowsiness and intoxication, as it were, (not indeed in a single night, as even the heaviest drunken bout usually can be, but) only gradually, through the space of many months, and even years; and until this be accomplished, we have to bear in little children so many things which we restrain in older persons, that we cannot enumerate them. Now, as touching this enormous amount of ignorance and weakness, [I ask] if it be true that infants have in this present life accumulated it as soon as they were born, where, when, how, have they become suddenly implicated in such darkness by the perpetration of some great iniquity?

¹ Gen. ii. 23.² Gen. ii. 19.

CHAP. 68. [XXXVII.]—*If Adam was not created of such a character as that in which we are born, how is it that Christ, although free from sin, was born an infant and in weakness? The weakness of the flesh a penal thing, even in infants.*

Some one will ask, If this nature is not pure, but is faulty in its origin, since Adam was not created of such, how is it that Christ, who is far more excellent, and was certainly born of a virgin without any sin, appeared in such weakness, and came into the world in the state of infancy? To this question our answer is as follows: Adam was not created in such a state, because, as no sin from a parent preceded him, he was not created in sinful flesh. We, however, are in such a condition, because by reason of his preceding sin we are born in sinful flesh; while Christ was born in such a state, because, in order that He might condemn sin, He assumed the likeness of sinful flesh. The question, however, which we are now discussing is not about Adam in respect of the size of his body, since he was not made an infant, but in the perfection of a full-grown man; and it may indeed be said that the beasts were thus created likewise,—nor was it owing to their sin that their young happened to be born so small in stature. Why indeed all this came to pass we are not now asking. But the question before us has regard to the degree of man's intellectual power and his use of reason, by virtue of which Adam, who was capable of instruction, was able to understand God's moral law and commandment, and if he so willed, to observe and keep it without any difficulty; whereas man is now born in such a state as to be utterly incapable of doing so, owing to his dreadful ignorance and weakness, not indeed of body, but of mind,—although we must all admit that in every infant there exists a rational soul of the self-same substance (and no other) as that which belonged to the first man. Still this very infirmity of the flesh, complete as it is, clearly, in my opinion, points to a something, whatever it may be, that is penal. It raises the doubt whether, if the first human beings had not sinned, they would have had children who could use neither tongue, nor hands, nor feet; that they should be born in the diminutive state of infancy was perhaps absolutely necessary, owing to the limited capacity of the womb.

But, at the same time, it does not follow, because a rib is a small part of a man's body, that God made [the first] man an infant wife, and then built her up into a woman. The manner of her creation indeed suggests the reflection that God's almighty power was competent to make her children also, soon to be born to her, adult at once.

CHAP. 69. [XXXVIII.]—*The ignorance and the infirmity of an infant.*

But not to dwell on this, that was at least possible to them which has actually happened to many animals, that although their young are born of diminutive stature, and without power either of increasing in bodily bulk or of advancing in mental faculty, the little creatures yet run about, and recognise their mothers, and require no external help or care when they want to suck, but with remarkable ease discover their mothers' breasts themselves, although these are concealed from ordinary sight. A human being, on the contrary, at his birth is furnished neither with legs fit for walking, nor with hands able even to scratch; and unless their lips were actually applied to the breast by the mother, they would not know where to find it; and even when close to the nipple, they would, notwithstanding their desire for food, be more able to cry than to suck. It cannot be denied, then, that this utter helplessness of body fits in with their infirmity of mind; nor would Christ's flesh have been "in the likeness of sinful flesh," unless sinful flesh had been such that the rational soul is oppressed by it in the way we have described. And as for this rational soul, whether it has been derived from parents, or created in each case for the individual separately, or whether it be an inspiration from above, I now forbear from inquiring.

CHAP. 70. [XXXIX.]—*How far sin is done away in infants, also in adults, and what advantage results therefrom. No man, except by an ineffable miracle, is in this life entirely freed from all evil concupiscence. Sins of ignorance and infirmity.*

In infants it is certain that, by the grace of God, through *His* baptism who came in the likeness of sinful flesh, it is brought to pass that the sin of the flesh is done away. This result, however, is so effected, that the concupiscence which is diffused over and innate in this very living flesh of ours is not removed all at once, so as to exist in it no longer; but only

that it might not be injurious to a man at his death, as it was inherent at his birth. For should an infant survive his baptism, and arrive at an age capable of obedience to a law, he finds there a concupiscence to fight against, and, by God's help, to overcome, unless he has received His grace in vain, and is willing to be a reprobate. For not even to those who are of riper years is it given in their baptism (except, it may be, by an indescribable miracle of the almighty Creator), that *the law of sin* which is in their members, warring against the law of their mind, should be entirely extinguished, and cease to exist; but that *whatever of evil has been done, said, or thought* by a man whilst his mind was subject to this concupiscence, and he its servant, should be abolished, and regarded as if it had never occurred; whilst the concupiscence itself, however, (notwithstanding the loosening of the chain of sin by which the devil, operating through it, used to keep the soul in bondage, and although the barrier is destroyed which separated man from his Maker,) remains engaged in the contest in which we chasten our body and bring it into subjection; has to be relaxed by being directed to lawful and necessary uses, or to be restrained by continence.¹ But inasmuch as the Spirit of God, who knows so much better than we do all the past, and present, and future of the human race, foresaw and foretold that the life of man would be such that "no man living should be justified in God's sight,"² it happens that through ignorance or infirmity we do not exert all the powers of our will against this [evil concupiscence,] and so yield to it in the commission of even sundry unlawful things,—becoming worse in proportion to the frequency and greatness of our surrender; and better, the less frequent and less complete our submission may be. The investigation, however, of the point in which we are now interested—whether there could possibly be (or whether in fact there is, has been, or ever will be) a man without sin in this present life, except Him who said, "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me"³—requires a much fuller discussion; and the arrangement of the present treatise is such as to make us postpone the question to the commencement of another book.

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 27.

² Ps. cxliii. 2.

³ John xiv. 30.

BOOK SECOND.

IN WHICH AUGUSTINE ARGUES AGAINST SUCH AS SAY THAT IN THE PRESENT LIFE THERE ARE, HAVE BEEN, AND WILL BE, MEN WHO HAVE ABSOLUTELY NO SIN AT ALL. HE LAYS DOWN FOUR PROPOSITIONS ON THIS HEAD, AND TEACHES,—FIRST, THAT A MAN MIGHT POSSIBLY LIVE IN THE PRESENT LIFE WITHOUT SIN, BY THE GRACE OF GOD AND HIS OWN FREE WILL; HE NEXT SHOWS THAT NEVERTHELESS IN FACT THERE IS NO MAN WHO LIVES QUITE FREE FROM SIN IN THIS LIFE; THIRDLY, HE SETS FORTH THE REASON OF THIS,—BECAUSE THERE IS NO MAN WHO EXACTLY CONFINES HIS WISHES WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE JUST REQUIREMENT OF EACH CASE, WHICH JUST REQUIREMENT HE EITHER FAILS TO PERCEIVE, OR IS UNWILLING TO CARRY OUT IN PRACTICE; IN THE FOURTH PLACE, HE PROVES THAT THERE IS NOT, NOR HAS BEEN, NOR EVER WILL BE, A HUMAN BEING—EXCEPT THE ONE MEDIATOR, CHRIST—WHO IS FREE FROM ALL SIN.

CHAP. I. [I.]—*What has thus far been dwelt on; and what is to be treated in this book.*

WE have, my dearest Marcellinus, discussed at sufficient length, I think, in the former book the baptism of infants,—how that it is given to them not only for an entrance into the kingdom of God, but also for attaining salvation and eternal life, which none can have out of the kingdom of God,—and without that union with the Saviour Christ, to which He has redeemed us by His blood. I undertake in the present book to discuss and explain the question, Whether there lives in this world, or has yet lived, or ever will live, a man without any sin whatever, except “the one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all;”¹—and this I will do with as much care and ability as He may Himself vouchsafe to me. And should there occasionally arise in this discussion, either casually or inevitably from the argument, any question about the baptism or the sin of infants, I must neither be surprised nor be induced to shrink from giving the best answer I can, at such emergencies, to whatever point challenges my attention.

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.

CHAP. 2. [II.]—*Some persons attribute too much to the freedom of man's will; its ignorance and infirmity.*

A solution is extremely necessary of this question about man's life being unassailed by any surreptitious or sudden pre-occupation of sin, in consequence even of our daily prayers; for there are some persons who presume so much upon the absolute freedom of man's will, as to suppose that it need not sin, and that we require no divine assistance,—attributing this freedom of the will to our own natural power. An inevitable consequence of this is, that we need not pray “not to enter into temptation,”—in other words, not to be overcome of temptation, either when it deceives and surprises us in our *ignorance* of its approach, or when it presses and importunes us in our *weakness* to resist it. Now how hurtful this is, and how fatally opposed to our salvation in Christ, and how violently adverse to the very religion with which we are impressed, and to the piety whereby we worship God, it cannot but be for us not to beseech the Lord for the attainment of such a benefit, but be rather led to think that petition of the Lord's Prayer, “Lead us not into temptation,”¹ to be a vain and useless insertion, it is beyond my ability to express in words.

CHAP. 3. [III.]—*In what way God commands nothing impossible. Works of mercy means of wiping out sins.*

Now these people imagine that they say a sharp thing (as if none among us knew anything like it) to this effect, that “if we have not the will, we commit no sin; nor would God command man to do what was impossible for human volition.” But they do not see this important fact, that in order to overcome certain things, which are the objects either of an evil desire or an ill-conceived fear, men need the strenuous efforts, and sometimes even all the energies, of the will, which [the Holy Ghost] foresaw that we should only imperfectly employ in every instance, when He willed so true an utterance to be spoken by the prophet: “In Thy sight shall no man living be justified.”² The Lord, foreseeing that such would be our character, was pleased to provide and endow with efficacious virtue certain healthful remedies against the guilt and bonds even of sins committed after baptism,—for instance, the works

¹ Matt. vi. 13.

² Ps. cxliii. 2.

of mercy,—as when he says: “Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven; give, and it shall be given unto you.”¹ For who could quit this life with any hope of obtaining eternal salvation, with that sentence impending: “Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all,”² if it did not soon after follow: “So speak ye, and so do, as they that shall be judged by the law of liberty: for he shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy; and mercy rejoiceth against judgment?”³

CHAP. 4. [IV.]—*Concupiscence, how far in us; the baptized are not injured by concupiscence, but only by consent therewith; the three last petitions of the Lord's Prayer.*

Concupiscence, therefore, as the law of sin which remains in the members of this body of death, is born with infants; in baptized infants it is deprived of guilt; it is left for the struggle [of life]; such infants as die before the struggle begins it does not pursue with any condemnation; unbaptized infants it binds as guilty and as children of wrath, and even if they die in infancy it involves them in condemnation. In baptized adults, however, endowed with reason, whatever consent their mind gives to this concupiscence for the commission of sin is an act of their own will. After all sins have been blotted out, and that guilt has been cancelled which by nature⁴ bound men in a conquered condition, concupiscence still remains,—but not to hurt in any way those who yield no assent to the commission of improper actions,—and it will remain until death is swallowed up in victory, and until, in that perfection of peace, nothing is left to be conquered. Such, however, as yield assent to it for the commission of sinful deeds, it holds as guilty still; and unless, through the medicine of repentance, and through the works of mercy, by the intercession in our behalf of the heavenly High Priest, these sins be healed, then [this concupiscence] conducts us to the second death and utter condemnation. It was on this account that the Lord, when instructing us in prayer, advised us, besides other petitions, to say: “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us

¹ Luke vi. 37, 38.

² Jas. ii. 10.

³ Jas. ii. 12.

⁴ Originalited, *i.e.* owing to birth-sin.

from evil.”¹ For evil remains in our flesh, not by reason of the nature in which man was created by divine power and wisdom, but owing to that fault into which he fell of his own will, and in which, since he has lost its powers of choice, he is not healed with the same facility of will as that with which which he was wounded. Of this evil it is the apostle says: “I know that in my flesh dwelleth no good thing;”² and it is likewise to the same evil that he counsels us to give no obedience, when he says: “Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, to obey the lusts thereof.”³ When, therefore, we have by an unlawful inclination of our will yielded assent to the lustful desires of the flesh, we say, with a view to the cure of this fault, “Forgive us our debts;”⁴ and we at the same time apply the remedy of a work of mercy, in that we add, “As we forgive our debtors.” When, however, we yield no such assent, we pray for assistance, and say, “Lead us not into temptation,”—not that God ever Himself tries any one with such kind of temptation, “for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man;”⁵ [but the purport of our prayer is,] that whenever we happen to feel the rising of temptation from our concupiscence, we should not be deserted by His help, in order that thereby we may be strong enough to conquer, and not be carried away by the attraction of lust. We then add our request for that which is to be perfected at the last, “when mortality shall be swallowed up of life.”⁶ “But deliver us from evil.”⁷ For then there will exist no longer a concupiscence with which we must struggle, and from which we must be bidden to withhold our consent. The whole substance, accordingly, of these three petitions may be thus briefly expressed: “Forgive us those things in which we have been drawn aside by concupiscence; help us against the temptations of concupiscence; take away from us all concupiscence.”

CHAP. 5. [v.]—*The will of man requires the help of God.*

Now for the commission of sin we get no help from God; but to do justly, and to fulfil the law of righteousness in every part thereof, we have no ability whatever, except as God shall

¹ Matt. vi. 12, 13.

² Rom. vii. 18.

³ Rom. vi. 12.

⁴ Matt. vi. 12.

⁵ Jas. i. 13.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 4.

⁷ Matt. vi. 13.

help us. For as the bodily eye is not assisted by the light that it may turn away therefrom shut and averted, but gets the assistance of the light in order that it may see,—being wholly incapable of vision without such help,—so God, who is the light of the inner man, aids our mental sight, in order that we do some good, not after our own, but according to His righteousness. Whenever we turn away from Him, it is our own act; we then show carnal wisdom, we then give our consent to the unholy promptings of fleshly concupiscence. When we turn to Him, God helps us; when we turn away from Him, He forsakes us. But then He helps us even to turn to Him,—an action which that [divine] light of which we speak certainly does not show to the eyes of our body. When, therefore, He commands us in the words, “Turn ye unto me, and I will turn unto you,”¹ and we say to Him, “Turn us, O God of our salvation,”² and again, “Turn us, O God of hosts;”³ what else do we in fact say than, “Give us what Thou commandest?”⁴ When, also, He commands us, saying, “Understand now, ye simple among the people,”⁵ and we say to Him, “Give me understanding, that I may learn Thy commandments;”⁶ what else do we really say than, “Give us what Thou commandest?” So when He commands us, saying, “Go not after thy lusts,”⁷ and we say to Him, “We know that no man can be continent, except God enable him;”⁸ what do we indeed say to Him, but “Give us, O Lord, what Thou commandest?” When, again, He commands us, saying, “Keep judgment, and do justice,”⁹ and we say to Him, “Teach me Thy judgments, O Lord;”¹⁰ what else do we say in fact than, “Give us, Lord, what Thou commandest?” In like manner, when He says: “Blessed are they which hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled,”¹¹ from whom ought we to seek for the meat and drink of righteousness, but from Him who promises His fulness to such as hunger and thirst after it?

¹ Zech. i. 3.² Ps. lxxxv. 4.³ Ps. lxxx. 3, 4.⁴ Da quod jubes; see the *Confessions*, Book x. chap. 26.⁵ Ps. xciv. 8.⁶ Ps. cxix. 73.⁷ Eccclus. xviii. 30.⁸ Wisd. viii. 21.⁹ Isa. lvi. 1.¹⁰ Ps. cxix. 108.¹¹ Matt. v. 6.

CHAP. 6.—*Wherein the Pharisee sinned when he thanked God ; to God's grace must be added the exertion of our own will.*

Let us then refuse to lend an ear or to give heed to those who assert that, after the choice of our own free will has been accepted, we are not bound to pray that God would help us not to sin. By such darkness as this even the Pharisee was not blinded ; for although he erred in thinking that he needed no addition to his righteousness, and supposed himself to be endowed with an absolute sufficiency thereof, he yet thanked God that he was not "like other men, unjust, extortioners, adulterers, or even as the publican ; for he fasted twice in the week, he gave tithes of all that he possessed."¹ He wished, indeed, for no addition to his own righteousness ; but then, by giving thanks to God, he allowed that all he had he had in fact received from Him ; and yet he was not approved, both because he asked for no further aliments of righteousness, as if he already had enough, and because he arrogantly and ostentatiously preferred himself to the publican, who was hungering and thirsting after righteousness. What, then, is to be said of those who, whilst acknowledging that they have no righteousness, or no fulness thereof, presume to pray for its acquisition from themselves simply, not from their Creator, in whom lies its store and fountain ? And yet this is not a question about prayers alone ; there must be super-added a consideration of the efficacy of our own will in its co-operation [with prayer]. God is said to be "*our Helper* ;"² but nobody can be *helped* who does not make some effort of his own accord. For God does not work our salvation in us as if we were mere stones, without sensibility, or creatures in whose nature He had placed neither reason nor will. Why, however, He helps one man, but not another ; or why one man so much, and another not to the same extent ; or why one man in one way, and another in another way,—are points which He reserves to Himself according to the method of His own most secret judgment, and to the excellency of His power.

¹ Luke xviii. 11, 12.

² Ps. xl. 17, lxx. 5.

CHAP. 7. [VI.]—*Four questions on the perfection of righteousness: (1.) Whether a man can be without sin in this life.*

Now those who aver that a man can exist in this life without sin, must not be opposed all out of hand with incautious temerity; for if we should deny the possibility, we should derogate both from man's free will, who in his wish desires this [sinlessness], and from the power or mercy of God, who effects it by His help. But it is one question, whether there *could* exist such a sinless man; and another question, whether he *does* exist. Again, it is one question, *why* (on the supposition of the possibility of such a man's existence, but in face of the fact that there is none such) he does not exist; and another question, *whether* such a man as had never sinned at all, not only is in existence, but also has been able to exist [at any former time], or could exist [at any future time]. Now, if in the order of this fourfold set of interrogative propositions, I were asked, [1st,] Whether it be possible for a man in this life to be without sin? I should allow the possibility, through the grace of God and the man's own free will; for I should have no doubt that the free will itself is ascribable to God's grace,—in other words, has its place amongst the gifts of God,—not only as to its existence, but also in respect of its goodness; that is to say, [it is a gift of God] that it applies itself to doing the commandments of God. Thus it is that God's grace not only shows a man what he ought to do, but also gives him such assistance as secures the possibility of that being done which His grace points out to be done. "What indeed have we that we have not received?"¹ Whence Jeremiah says: "I know, O Lord, that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps."² Accordingly, when in the Psalms one says to God, "Thou hast commanded me to keep Thy precepts diligently,"³ he at once adds a disclaimer of his own ability, and only wishes to be able to keep these precepts: "O that my ways," says he, "were directed to keep Thy statutes! Then should I not be ashamed, when I have respect to all Thy commandments."⁴ Now who ever wishes for what he has already so entirely in his own power, that he requires no further help

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

² Jer. x. 23.

³ Ps. cxix. 4.

⁴ Ps. cxix. 5, 6.

for effecting his purpose? To whom, however, he should look for the fulfilment of his wish,—not to fortune, or fate, or any one else but God,—he shows with sufficient clearness in the following words, where he says: “Order my steps in Thy word; and let not any iniquity have dominion over me.”¹ From the thralldom of this execrable dominion they are liberated, to whom, on their receiving Him, the Lord Jesus gave power to become the sons of God.² From so horrible a tyranny were they to be freed, to whom He says, “If the Son shall make you free, then shall ye be free indeed.”³ From these and many other like testimonies, I cannot doubt that God has laid no impracticable command on man; and that, by God's grace and help, everything which He commands is able to be brought to good effect. In this way may a man, if he pleases, be without sin by the assistance of God.

CHAP. 8. [VII.]—*Second question: Whether there is in this world a man without sin.*

If, however, I am asked the second question which I have suggested,—whether there be a sinless man,—I believe there is no such person. For I have perfect confidence in the Scripture, which says: “Enter not into judgment with Thy servant; for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified.”⁴ There is therefore need of the mercy of God, which “rejoiceth against judgment,”⁵ and which that man shall not obtain who displays it not in his own conduct.⁶ And whereas the prophet says, “I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my heart,”⁷ he yet immediately adds, “For this shall every one that is godly pray unto Thee in an acceptable time.”⁸ “*Every one*,”—not indeed every sinner, but every saint; for it is the voice of saints which says, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”⁹ Accordingly we read, in the Apocalypse of the same Apostle John, of “the hundred and forty and four thousand” saints, “which were not defiled with women; for they continued virgins: and in their mouth was found no guile; for they are without fault.”¹⁰ “Without

¹ Ps. cxix. 133.

² John i. 12.

³ John viii. 36.

⁴ Ps. cxliii. 2.

⁵ Jas. ii. 13.

⁶ Jas. ii. 13.

⁷ Ps. xxxii. 5.

⁸ Ps. xxxii. 6.

⁹ 1 John i. 8.

¹⁰ Rev. xiv. 3-5.

fault," indeed, they no doubt are, because they really and truly enough found fault in themselves; and "in their mouth was discovered no guile or deception, because if they said they had no sin, they deceived themselves, and the truth was not in them;"¹ and of course, where the truth was not, there would be lying and guile. When a righteous man begins a statement by accusing himself, he verily utters no falsehood.

CHAP. 9.—*The beginning of renewal; resurrection called regeneration; they are the sons of God who lead lives suitable to newness of life.*

And hence in the passage, "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, and cannot commit sin, for His seed remaineth in him,"² and in every other passage of like import, they find much to deceive themselves by an inadequate consideration of the [gist of the] Scriptures; for they fail to observe that men severally become sons of God when they begin to live in newness of spirit, and to be renewed as to the inner man after the image of Him that created them.³ For it is not from the moment of a man's baptism that all his old infirmity is destroyed. Renovation rather begins with the remission of all his sins, and so far as he who is now wise shows spirituality of wisdom. All things else, indeed, are accomplished in hope, with the view of their being also realized in fact,⁴ even to the renewal of the very body in that better state of immortality and incorruption with which we shall be clothed at the resurrection of the dead. For even this the Lord calls a regeneration,—though, of course, not such as occurs through baptism, but still a regeneration wherein that which is now begun in the spirit shall be brought to perfection also in the body. "In the regeneration," says He, "when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."⁵ For however entire and full be the remission of sins which takes place in baptism, there is yet continually going on an entire and full change of the man towards his everlasting renovation. I do not mean the change in his body, which is most clearly tending evermore to the old corruption and to death, after which there is to be a renewal,

¹ 1 John i. 8.

² 1 John iii. 9.

³ See Col. iii. 10.

⁴ *Donec etiam in re fiant.*

⁵ Matt. xix. 28.

which shall consist of an absolutely perfect newness of condition. I therefore now omit consideration of the body. Taking, however, the soul, which is the inner man, [the change which it is undergoing is, I say, a progressive one; for] if it were a perfect renewal thereof which takes place in baptism, the apostle would not say: "But though our outward man perishes, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."¹ Now, undoubtedly, he who is renewed day by day is not as yet wholly renewed; and inasmuch as he is not yet wholly renewed, he is so far in his old state. Since, then, men, even after they are baptized, are still in some degree in their old condition, they are on that account also still children of the world; but inasmuch as they are also admitted into a new state, that is to say, by the full and perfect remission of their sins [in baptism], and in so far as they are spiritually-minded, and cherish a disposition suitable to that spiritual mind, they are the children of God. Internally we put off the old man and put on the new; for we then and there lay aside lying, and speak truth, and [cultivate] those other qualities wherein the apostle makes to consist the putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.² Now it is men who are already baptized and faithful whom he exhorts to do all this,—an exhortation which would be unsuitable to them, if the absolute and perfect change had been already made in their baptism; and yet [in one sense] made it was, since we were then actually *saved*; for "He saved us by the laver of regeneration."³ In another passage, however, he tells us how this took place. "Not they only," says he, "but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope: but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it."⁴

CHAP. 10. [VIII.]—*Perfection, when to be realized.*

Our full adoption, then, as children, is to happen at the re-

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 16.

² Eph. iv. 24.

³ Tit. iii. 5.

⁴ Rom. viii. 23-25.

demption of our body. It is therefore the first-fruits of the Spirit which we now possess, whence we are already really become the children of God ; for the rest, indeed, as it is by hope that we are saved and renewed, so [thus far] are we the children of God. But inasmuch as we are not yet actually saved, we are for that reason not yet fully renewed, nor yet fully also sons of God, but children of this world. We are therefore advancing in renewal and holiness of life, in that we are children of God, and hereby also we cannot commit sin. [And this progress in holiness, with its attendant inability to sin, will go on] until our whole condition be changed,—even that which keeps us still children of this world ; for it is owing to this [remainder of evil in us] that we are even yet able to commit sin. Hence it comes to pass that “ whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin ; ”¹ and “ if we were to say that we have no sin, we should deceive ourselves, and the truth would not be in us.”² There shall be then an end put to the state within us which keeps us children of the flesh and of the world ; whilst that other condition shall be perfected which makes us the children of God, and renews us by His Spirit. Accordingly the same [Apostle] John says, “ Beloved, now are we the sons of God ; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be.”³ Now what means this variety in the expressions, “ *now are we,* ” and “ *what we shall be,* ” but this—*we are in hope, we shall be in reality ?* For he goes on to say, “ We know that when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is.”⁴ We have therefore even now begun to be like Him, as we have the first-fruits of the Spirit ; but yet even now we are unlike Him, by reason of the old nature which leaves its remains in us. In as far, then, as we are like Him, in so far are we, by the regenerating Spirit, sons of God ; but in as far as we are unlike Him, in so far are we the children of the flesh and of this world. On the one side, we cannot commit sin ; but, on the other, if we say that we have no sin, we only deceive ourselves. [And so it must be,] until our entire state pass into the adoption, and there be not a sinner more, and you look for his place and find it not.⁵

¹ 1 John iii. 9.² 1 John i. 8.³ 1 John iii. 2.⁴ 1 John iii. 2.⁵ Ps. xxxvi. 10.

CHAP. 11. [IX.]—*An objection of the Pelagians—Why does not a righteous man beget a righteous man?*¹

In vain, then, do some of them argue: "Since the sinner beget a sinner, so that the guilt of this birth-sin must in his infant son be done away by his receiving baptism, in like manner ought the righteous man to have begotten a righteous son." Just as if a man beget children in the flesh by reason of his righteousness, and not because he is moved thereto by the concupiscence which is in his members, and because the law of sin is applied by the law of his mind to the purpose of procreation. His begetting children, therefore, shows that he still retains the old nature among the children of this world; it does not arise from the fact of his progress to newness of life among the children of God. For "the children of this world [marry and are given in marriage], beget children and are begotten."² And their offspring is like themselves; for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh."³ Only the children of God, however, are righteous; but in so far as they are the children of God, they do not carnally beget, because it is of the Spirit, and not of the flesh, that they are themselves begotten. But as many of them as become parents, beget children from the circumstance that they have not yet put off the entire remains of their old nature in exchange for the perfect renovation which awaits them. It follows, therefore, that every son who is born in this old and infirm condition of his father's nature, must needs himself partake of the same old and infirm condition. In order, then, that he may be begotten again, he must also himself be renewed by the Spirit through the remission of sin; and if this change does not take place in him, his righteous father will be of no use to him. For it is by the Spirit that *he* is righteous, but it is not by the Spirit that he beget his son. On the other hand, if this change does accrue to him, he will not be prejudiced or damaged by having an unrighteous father: for it is by the grace of the Spirit that he has passed into the hope of the eternal regeneration; whereas it is owing to his carnal mind that his father has wholly remained in the old nature.

¹ [See below, c. 25; also *De Nuptiis*, i. 18; also *contra Julianum*, vi. 5.]

² Luke xx. 34.

³ John iii. 6.

CHAP. 12. [x.]—*He reconciles some passages of Scripture ; in Noah, Daniel, and Job, three classes of men are represented.*

The statement, therefore, "He that is born of God sinneth not,"¹ is not contrary to the passage in which it is declared by those who are born of God, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."² For however complete may be a man's present hope, and however real may be his renewal by spiritual regeneration in that part of his nature, he still, for all that, carries about a body which is corrupt, and which presses down his soul ; and so long as this is the case, one must distinguish even in the same individual what is the tendency of each several action, and from what source it is said to arise. Now, I suppose it is not easy to find in God's Scripture so weighty a testimony of holiness given of any man as that which is written of His three servants, Noah, Daniel, and Job, whom the Prophet Ezekiel describes as the only men able to be delivered from God's impending wrath.³ In these three men he no doubt prefigures three classes of mankind to be delivered : in Noah, as I suppose, are represented righteous leaders of nations, by reason of his government of the ark as a type of the Church ; in Daniel, men who are holy in continence ; in Job, those who are holy in wedlock ;—to say nothing of any other view which may be entertained of the passage, but which it is unnecessary for me now to consider. It is, at any rate, clear from this testimony of the prophet, and from other inspired statements, how eminent were these worthies in righteousness. Yet no man must be led by any statement in their history to say, for instance, that there is no sin in drunkenness, although so good a man as one of these was surprised into it ; for we read that Noah was once drunk,⁴ but God forbid that it should be thought that he was an habitual drunkard.

CHAP. 13.—*A subterfuge of the Pelagians.*

Daniel, indeed, after the prayer which he poured out before God, actually says respecting himself, "Whilst I was praying and confessing my sins, and the sins of my people, before the Lord my God."⁵ This is the reason, if I am not mistaken,

¹ 1 John iii. 9.

² 1 John i. 8.

³ Ezek. xiv. 14.

⁴ Gen. ix. 21.

⁵ Dan. ix. 20.

why in the above-mentioned Prophet Ezekiel a certain most haughty person is asked, "Art thou then wiser than Daniel?"¹ Nor on this point can that be possibly said which some contend for in opposition to the Lord's Prayer: "For although that prayer was offered by the apostles, after they became holy and perfect, and had no sin whatever of their own, yet it was not in behalf of their own selves, but of imperfect and still sinful men that they said, 'Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors.' They used the word *our*," they say, "in order to show that in one and the same body are contained both those who still have sins, and themselves, who are now altogether free from sin." Now this certainly cannot be said in the case of Daniel, who being (as I suppose) a prophet endued with a foresight of this presumptuous opinion, after so often saying in his prayer, "We have sinned," put no such construction on his words or their purport, as if we must suppose him to have said, "Whilst I was praying and confessing to my God, the sins of my people," [with no reference to his own;] nor yet did he confound the distinct objects of his supplication, so as to leave it uncertain whether he had in view the fellowship of one body by using such words as, While I was confessing *our* sins to the Lord my God; but he expresses himself in language so distinct and precise, as if he were full of the distinction himself, and wanted above all things to commend it to our notice: "*My sins*," says he, "and the sins of my people." Who can gainsay such evidence as this, but he who is more pleased to defend what he thinks than to find out what he ought to think?

CHAP. 14.—*Job was not without sin.*

But let us see what Job has to say of himself, after God's great testimony of his righteousness. "I know of a truth," he says, "that it is so: for how shall a mortal man be just before the Lord? For if He should enter into judgment with him, he would not be able to obey Him."² And shortly afterwards he asks: "Who shall resist His judgment? Even if I should seem righteous, my mouth will speak profanely."³ And again, further on, he says: "I know He will not leave

¹ Ezek. xxviii. 3.

² Job ix. 2, 3 (Sept.).

³ Vers. 19, 20.

me unpunished. But since I am ungodly, why have I not died? If I should wash myself with snow, and be purged with clean hands, thou hadst thoroughly stained me with filth."¹ In another of his discourses he says: "For Thou hast written evil things against me, and hast compassed me with the sins of my youth; and Thou hast placed my foot in the stocks. Thou hast watched all my works, and hast inspected the soles of my feet, which wax old like a bottle, or like a moth-eaten garment. For man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of wrath; like a flower that hath bloomed, so doth he fall; he is gone like a shadow, and continueth not. Hast Thou not taken account even of him, and caused him to enter into judgment with Thee? For who is pure from uncleanness? Not even one; even should his life last but a day."² Then a little afterwards he says: "Thou hast numbered all my devices and necessities; and not one of my sins hath escaped Thee. Thou hast sealed up my transgressions in a bag, and hast marked whatever I have done unwillingly."³ See how Job confesses his sins, and says indeed how sure he is that there is none righteous before the Lord. So he is sure of this also, that if we say we have no sin, the truth is not in us. While, therefore; God bestows on him His high testimony of righteousness, according to the standard of human conduct, Job himself, taking his measure from that rule of righteousness, which, as well as he can, he beholds in God, knows of a truth that so it is; and he goes on at once to say, "How shall a mortal man be just before the Lord? For if He should enter into judgment with him, he would not be able to obey Him;" in other words, if, when challenged to judgment, he wished to show that there was nothing in him which He could condemn, he would be unable to comply with His injunctions, since he misses even that obedience which might enable him to obey Him who teaches that sins ought to be confessed. Accordingly [the Lord] rebukes certain men, saying to them, "Why will ye contend with me in judgment?"⁴ This [the Psalmist] averts, saying, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant; for in

¹ Job ix. 30 (Sept.).

² Job xiii. 26, to xiv. 5 (Sept.).

³ Job xiv. 16, 17 (Sept.).

⁴ Jer. ii. 29.

Thy sight shall no man living be justified.”¹ In accordance with which, Job also asks: “For who shall resist His judgment? Even if I should seem righteous, my mouth will speak profanely;” which means: If, contrary to His judgment, I should call myself righteous, when His perfect rule of righteousness proves me to be unholy, then of a truth my mouth would speak profanely, because it would speak against the truth of God.

CHAP. 15.—*Carnal generation condemned on account of original sin.*

He sets forth the absolute weakness, or rather condemnation, of our carnal generation from the transgression of original sin, when, treating of his own sins, he shows, as it were, their very causes, and says that “man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of wrath.” Of what wrath, but of that in which all are involved, as the apostle says, “We are by nature,” that is, by our original sin, “children of wrath,”² inasmuch as all are children of carnal desire and of the world? He further shows that to this wrath also pertains, as its consequence, the death of man. For after saying, “Hath but a short time to live, and is full of wrath,” he added, “Like a flower that hath bloomed, so doth he fall; he is gone like a shadow, and continueth not.” He then subjoins: “Hast Thou not caused him to enter into judgment with Thee? For who is pure from uncleanness? Not even one; even should his life last but a day.” In these words he in fact says, Thou hast thrown upon man, short-lived though he be, the care of entering into judgment with Thee. For how brief soever be his life,—even if it last but a single day,—he could not possibly be clean of filth; and therefore with perfect justice must he come under Thy judgment. Then, when he says again, “Thou hast numbered all my devices and necessities, and not one of my sins hath escaped Thee: Thou hast sealed up my transgressions in a bag, and hast marked whatever I have done unwillingly;” is it not clear enough that even those sins are justly imputed to a man which he commits through no allurements of mere pleasure, but for the sake of avoiding some trouble, or pain, or death? Now these sins, too, are said to be committed under some

¹ Ps. cxliii. 2.

² Eph. ii. 3.

stress of necessity, whereas they ought all to be overcome by the love and pleasure of righteousness. Again, what he said in the clause, "Thou hast marked whatever I have done unwillingly," may evidently be connected with what was said [by the apostle]: "For what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that do I." ¹

CHAP. 16.—*Job foresaw that Christ would come to suffer; the way of humility in those that are perfect.*

Now it is remarkable ² that the Lord Himself, after bestowing on Job the testimony which is expressed in Scripture, that is, by the Spirit of God, "In all the things which happened to him he sinned not with his lips before the Lord," ³ did yet afterwards speak to him with a rebuke, as Job himself tells us: "Why do I yet plead, being admonished, and hearing the rebukes of the Lord?" ⁴ Now no man is fairly rebuked unless there be in him something which deserves rebuke. [XI.] And what sort of rebuke is that which is understood to proceed from the person of Christ our Lord? He recounts to him all the operations which indicated His divine power, rebuking him under this idea; so that He seems to say to him, "Canst thou effect all these mighty works as I can?" But to what purpose is all this but to teach Job wisdom (for this instruction was divinely inspired into him, that he might foreknow Christ's coming to suffer), that he might understand how patiently he ought to endure all that he went through, since Christ, although, when He became man for us, He was absolutely without sin, and although as God He possessed so great power, did for all that by no means refuse to obey even to the suffering of death? When Job understood this with a purer intensity of heart, he added to his own answer these words: "I used before now to hear of Thee by the hearing of the ear; but behold now mine eye seeth Thee: therefore I abhor myself and melt away, and account myself but dust and ashes." ⁵ Why was he displeased with himself in this so deep and profound a manner? God's work, in that he was man, could not rightly have given him displeasure, since it is even said to God Himself, "Despise not Thou the work of

¹ Rom. vii. 15.

⁴ Job xxxix. 34 (Sept.).

² Quid quod.

⁵ Job xlii. 5, 6.

³ Job i. 22.

Thine own hands.”¹ It was indeed in view of that righteousness, in which he had discovered his own unrighteousness,² that he abhorred himself and melted away, and deemed himself dust and ashes,—beholding, as he did in his mind, the righteousness of Christ, in whom there could not possibly be any sin, not only in respect of His divinity, but also of His soul and His flesh. It was also in view of this righteousness which is of God that the Apostle Paul, although as “touching the righteousness which is of the law he was blameless,” yet “counted all things” not only as loss, but even as dung.³

CHAP. 17. [XII.]—*No one righteous in all things; Job not afflicted because of his sins.*⁴

That illustrious testimony, therefore, in which Job is commended, is not contrary to the passage in which it is said, “In Thy sight shall no man living be justified;”⁵ for it does not lead us to suppose that in him there was nothing at all which might either by himself really or by God rightly be blamed, although at the same time he might with no untruth be said to be a holy man, and a sincere worshipper of God, and one who kept himself from every evil work. For these are God’s words concerning him: “Hast thou diligently considered my servant Job? For there is none like him on the earth, a man blameless, holy, a true worshipper of God, who abstains from everything evil.”⁶ First, he is here praised for his excellence in comparison with all men on earth. He therefore excelled all who were at that time able to be righteous upon earth; and yet, because of this superiority over others in righteousness, he was not therefore altogether without sin. He is next said to be “*blameless*”—no one could fairly bring an accusation against him in respect of his conduct; “*holy*”—he had advanced so greatly in moral probity, that no man could be mentioned on a par with him; “*a true worshipper of God*”—because he sincerely and humbly confessed his own sins; a man “*who abstained from every evil thing*”—it would have been wonderful and strange, however,

¹ Ps. cxxxviii. 8.

² *Qua se noverat injustum.* Several mss. have *justum* [q. d. “had discovered what his own righteousness was,”—i. e. nothing].

³ Phil. iii. 6–8.

⁴ See below, chap. 23.

⁵ Ps. cxliii. 2.

⁶ Job i. 8.

if this abstinence had extended to every evil word and thought. How great a man indeed Job was, we are not told; but we know that he was a just man; we know, too, that in the endurance of terrible afflictions and trials he was great; and we know that it was not on account of his sins, but for the purpose of demonstrating his righteousness, that he had to bear so much suffering. But the language in which the Lord commends Job might also be applied to him who "delights in the law of God after the inner man, whilst he sees another law in his members warring against the law of his mind;"¹ especially as he says, "The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."² Observe how he too after the inward man abstains from every evil work, because such work he does not himself effect, but the evil which dwells in his flesh; and yet, although he derives that very ability to delight in the law of God only from the grace of God, he still exclaims in conscious yearning after deliverance, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? God's grace, through Jesus Christ our Lord."³

CHAP. 18. [XIII.]—*Man's perfect righteousness is imperfect.*

There are then on earth righteous men, great men, wise, chaste, patient, pious, merciful, who endure all kinds of temporal evil with an even mind for righteousness' sake. If, however, there is truth—nay, because there is truth—in these words, "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves,"⁴ and in these, "In Thy sight shall no man living be justified," even these worthies are not without sin; nor is there one among them so proud and foolish as not to feel how needful to him is the Lord's Prayer, by reason of his manifold sins, of whatever kind.

CHAP. 19. *Zacharias and Elisabeth.*

Now what must we say of Zacharias and Elisabeth, who are often alleged against us in discussions on this question? All we can say is, that there is clear evidence in the Scripture⁵ that Zacharias was a man of eminent holiness among the

¹ Rom. vii. 22, 23.

² Rom. vii. 19, 20.

³ Rom. vii. 24, 25.

⁴ 1 John i. 8.

⁵ Luke i. 6-9.

chief priests, whose duty it was to offer up the sacrifices of the Old Testament. We also read, however, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in a passage which I have already quoted in my previous book,¹ that Christ was the only High Priest who had no need, as those high priests are said to have had, to offer daily—first for Himself, and then for the people—sacrifices for sin. “For such a High Priest,” says [the apostle], “became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins.”² Amongst the high priests here referred to was Zacharias, amongst them was Phinehas, yea, Aaron himself, in whom this priesthood had its beginning, and whatever others there were whose lives were worthy of commendation for their righteous discharge of their priestly functions; and yet all these were under the necessity, first of all, of offering sacrifice for their own sins,—Christ, of whose future coming they were an earnest and a type, being the one only High Priest who had no such necessity, by reason of His freedom from all sinful taint.

CHAP. 20. *Paul worthy to be the prince of the apostles; the perfect wayfarer on the journey of eternal life.*

What commendation, however, is bestowed on Zacharias and Elisabeth which is not comprehended in what the apostle has said about himself before he believed in Christ? He said that, “as touching the righteousness which is in the law, he had been blameless.”³ The same is said also of them: “They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.”⁴ Whatever righteousness they had in them was not a pretence of virtue exhibited before men. Accordingly it is said, “They walked *before the Lord.*” But that which is written of Zacharias and his wife in the phrase, *in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord*, the apostle briefly expressed by the words, *in the law*. For there was not one law for him and another for them previous to the gospel. It was one and the same law which, as we read, was given by Moses to their fathers, and according

¹ See above, Book I. c. 50.

² Heb. vii. 26, 27.

³ Phil. iii. 6.

⁴ Luke i. 6. [See also his work, *De Gratia Christi*, 53.]

to the prescription of which Zacharias held his priestly office, and offered sacrifices in his course. And yet the apostle, who was then endued with the like righteousness, goes on to say: "But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ; for whose sake I have not only thought all things to be only detriments, but I have even counted them as dung, that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having my own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith: that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His suffering, being made conformable unto His death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead."¹ So far, then, is it from being true that we should, from the words in which Scripture describes them, suppose that Zacharias and Elisabeth had a perfect righteousness without any sin, that we must not, in fact, even regard the apostle himself as perfect in excellence according to the self-same rule,—[that he lacked perfection] not only in that righteousness of the law which he possessed in common with them, and which he counts as loss and dung in comparison with that most excellent righteousness which is by the faith of Christ, but also in the very gospel itself, wherein he deserved the pre-eminence of his great apostleship. Now I would not venture to say this if I did not deem it very wrong to refuse credence to himself. He extends the passage which we have quoted, and says: "Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; but I follow after, if I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."² Here he acknowledges that he has not yet attained, and is not yet perfect in that plenitude of righteousness which he longed to obtain in Christ, but that he was pursuing his aim, and, forgetting all that was behind and

¹ Phil. iii. 7-11.

² Phil. iii. 12-14.

past, was reaching out to the things which lay before him. We are sure, then, that what he says elsewhere is true even of himself: "Although our outward man is perishing, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."¹ Although he was a complete and excellent traveller, he had not yet attained the very end of his journey. All such as deserved this character he would fain take with him as companions of his course. This he expresses in the words which follow our former quotation: "Let as many, then, of us as are perfect, be thus minded: and if ye be yet of another mind, God will reveal even this also to you. Nevertheless, whereunto we have already attained, let us walk by that rule."² This "walk" is not that of the legs, but is accomplished by the affections of the soul and the character of the life, so that they who possess righteousness may arrive at perfection; advancing in newness of life day by day along the straight path of faith, they have by this time become wayfarers, perfect in the self-same righteousness.

CHAP. 21. [XIV.]

In like manner, all who are described in the Scriptures as exhibiting in their present life the good-will and the actions of righteousness, and all who have lived like them since, although lacking the same testimony of Scripture; or all who are even now living, or shall hereafter live, although they are all good and righteous, and are really worthy of all praise,—yet they are by no means without sin: inasmuch as, on the authority of the same Scriptures which supply us with the grounds of our belief in their virtues, we learn that in "God's sight no man living is justified;"³ whence arises our request to Him, that He would "not enter into judgment with His servants;"⁴ so that not only to all faithful people in general, but to each of them in particular, is the Lord's Prayer necessary, which He delivered to His disciples.⁵

CHAP. 22. [XV.]—*An objection of the Pelagians; perfection is relative; he is rightly said to be perfect in righteousness who has made much progress therein.*

Well, but the Lord says, "Be ye perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect,"⁶—an injunction which He would

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 16.² Phil. iii. 15, 16.³ Ps. cxliii. 2.⁴ Ps. cxliii. 2.⁵ Matt. vi. 12; Luke xi. 4.⁶ Matt. v. 48.

not have given, they say, if He had known that what He enjoined was impracticable. Now the present question is not whether it be possible for any men, during this present life, to be without sin if they receive adequate grace for the purpose, for *this* question we have already solved;¹ but what we have now to consider is, whether any man in fact achieves perfection. We have, however, already recognised the fact that no man's will keeps even pace with the just necessity of every circumstance [of duty], as also the testimony of the Scriptures, which we have quoted so largely above, declares. When, indeed, the perfection of any particular person is mentioned, we must look carefully at the sense in which it is mentioned. For I have just above quoted a passage of the apostle, wherein he confesses that he had not yet made that advance in the attainment of righteousness which he desires; but still he immediately adds, "Let as many of us as are perfect be thus minded." Now he would certainly not have uttered these two sentences if there were not a sense in which he was perfect, and another in which he was not perfect. For instance, a man may be perfect as a scholar in the pursuit of wisdom, which could not yet be said of those to whom [the apostle] said, "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye have not been able to bear it, neither are ye yet able;"² whereas to the former class he says, "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect,"—meaning, of course, to understand such as were perfect in the capacity of scholars. It may happen, therefore, as I have said, that a man may be already perfect as a scholar, though not as yet perfect as a teacher of wisdom; may be perfect as a learner, though not as yet perfect as a doer of righteousness; may be perfect as a lover of his enemies, though not as yet perfect in bearing their wrong.³ [Now, taking the case of him] who is so far perfect as to love all men, inasmuch as he has attained even to the love of his enemies, it still remains a question whether he be perfect in that love,—in other words, whether he feel towards the objects of his love so great a charity as is prescribed to be exercised towards them by the

¹ See above, chap. 7.

² 1 Cor. iii. 2.

³ *Ut sufferat* is his antithesis here to *ut diligit*.

unchangeable love of truth. Whenever, then, we read in the Scriptures of any man's perfection, it must be carefully considered in what sense the statement is made, since a man is not therefore to be understood as being entirely without sin because he is described as perfect in some particular thing; although the term may be, in a general sense, employed to show, not, indeed, that there is no longer any point left for a man to reach in his way to perfection, but that he has in fact advanced a very great way, and on that account may be deemed worthy of the designation. Thus, in the teaching of the law, a man may be said to be perfect, even if there be still considerable omission in his observance of it; and in the same manner the apostle called men perfect, to whom he said at the same time, "Yet if in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this to you. Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule."¹

CHAP. 23. [XVI.]—*Why God prescribes what He knows cannot be observed.*

We must not deny that God lays upon us such an injunction as this,—that we ought to be so perfect in accomplishing righteousness, as to have no sin at all. Now that cannot be sin, whatever it may be, unless God has enjoined that it shall not be. Why then, they ask, does He command what He knows very well no man living can perform? On this ground also an objection might be raised by asking, Why He laid an injunction on the first human beings, who were only two, which He knew they would not be able to obey? For it must not be pretended that He issued His command, that some of us might obey it, if they did not. The prohibition, indeed, that they should not partake of the fruit of the particular tree, God laid entirely on them, and on none besides; for as He knew what amount of righteousness they would fail to perform, so did He also know what righteous measures He meant Himself to adopt concerning them. In the same way He orders all men to commit no sin, although He knows beforehand that no man will fulfil the command, in order that He may, in the case of all who impiously despise His precepts so as to incur condemnation, Himself execute righteousness in

¹ Phil. iii. 15.

their condemnation ; and that He may at the same time, in the case of those who obediently and piously keep the way of His commandments, and who, while failing to observe to the utmost all things which He has enjoined, do yet forgive others as they wish to be forgiven themselves, Himself do what is just and good in their sanctification and acquittal. For how can forgiveness be bestowed by God's mercy on the forgiving, when there is no sin ? or how prohibition fail to be given by the justice of God, when there is sin ?

CHAP. 24.—*An objection of the Pelagians. The Apostle Paul was not free from the thorn of the flesh so long as he lived.*

But see, say they, how the apostle says, " I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith : henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness ;"¹ which it were impossible for him to say if he had any sin. It is for them, then, to explain how he could have said this, when there still remained for him to encounter the great conflict, the grievous and excessive weight of suffering which he had just said awaited him.² In order to finish his course, was there yet wanting only a small thing, when that in fact was still left to suffer wherein would exist a fiercer and more cruel foe ? If, however, he uttered such words of joy from feeling sure and certain, on the ground that the assurance and certainty had been inspired in him by One who had revealed to him the imminence of his suffering, then it was not from absolute realization, but from a very firm hope, that he spoke his famous words ; he assumed beforehand that such an issue was going to happen, just as if he were demonstrating that it had actually come to pass. If, therefore, he had added to those words the further statement, " I have no longer any sin," we must have understood him as even then expressing the idea of a perfection arising from a future prospect, not from an accomplished fact. For his having no sin pertained to the finishing of his course, because (as they suppose) that course was completed when he spoke these words ; just in the same way that his triumphing over his adversary in the decisive conflict of his passion had also reference to the finishing of his course. And our opponents must needs themselves allow that this completion remained

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 7.

² 2 Tim. iv. 6.

yet to be effected, when he uttered the exclamation which they quote. The whole of this consummation *we* in fact declare to have been even then awaiting its accomplishment, at the very moment when the apostle, with his perfect trust in the promise of God, spoke of it all as having been already realized. For it was in reference to the finishing of his course that he actually forgave the sins of those who sinned against him, and prayed that his own sins might in like manner be forgiven him; and it was in his most certain confidence in this promise of the Lord, [in His Prayer,] that he believed he should commit no sin in his encounter with that last end, which was still future, even when in his trustfulness he spoke of it as already accomplished. Now, omitting all other considerations, I wonder whether, when he uttered the words in which he seemed to imply that he had passed beyond the commission of sin, that "thorn of the flesh" had been yet removed out of him, for the withdrawal of which he had three times entreated the Lord, and had received this answer: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness."¹ For bringing so great a man to perfection, it was needful that there should not be withdrawn from him that "messenger of Satan" by whom he was therefore to be buffeted, "lest he should be unduly exalted by the abundance of his revelations."² Is there then any man so bold as either to think or to say, that any one who has to bend beneath the burden of this life is altogether clean from all sin whatever?

CHAP. 25.—*God punishes both in wrath and in mercy; there is no punishment but what is deserved by sin;*³ *Pelagius' character commendable.*

Although there are some men who are so eminent in holiness that God speaks to them out of His cloudy pillar, such as "Moses and Aaron among His priests, and Samuel among them that call upon His name,"⁴ the latter of whom is much praised for his piety and purity in the Scriptures of truth, from his earliest childhood, when his mother, to accomplish her vow, placed him in God's temple, and devoted him to the Lord as His servant, yet even of such men it is said, "Thou, O God, wast propitious unto them, though Thou didst

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9.

² 2 Cor. xii. 7.

³ See above, ch. 17.

⁴ Ps. xcix. 6.

punish all their devices.”¹ Now the children of wrath God punishes in anger; whereas it is in mercy that He chastises the children of grace; since “whom He loveth He correcteth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth.”² However, there are no punishments, no correction, no scourge of God, but what are owing to sin, except in the case of Him who prepared His back for the smiter, in order that He might undergo all our experience in our likeness without sin, in order that He might be the saintly Priest of saints, making intercession even for saints, who with no sacrifice of truth even say each one for himself, “Forgive us our trespasses, even as we also forgive them that trespass against us.”³ Wherefore even our opponents in this controversy, whilst they are chaste in their life, and commendable in character, and although they do not hesitate to do that which the Lord enjoined on the rich man, who inquired of Him about the attainment of eternal life, and who had told Him, in answer to His first question, that he had already fully kept every commandment in the law, that “if he wished to be perfect, he must sell all that he had and give to the poor, and transfer his treasure to heaven,”⁴ yet they do not in any one instance venture to say that they are without sin. But this, as we believe, they refrain from saying, with a mind to deceive; at any rate, when they propound their lies, this is the very point on which they begin either to augment or commit their sin.

CHAP. 26. [XVII].—*The third question: Why no one in this life is without sin. Two causes of sin, ignorance and infirmity; in men lies the reason why they are not assisted by God.*

Let us now consider the point which I mentioned as our third inquiry. Since man may possibly exist in this life without sin, when God’s grace assists the human will, how happens it that there is in fact no such man? To this question I might return a very easy and truthful answer: Because men are unwilling; but if I am asked why they are unwilling, we are drawn into a lengthy statement. And yet, without prejudice to a longer disquisition, I may briefly say this much: Men are unwilling to do what is just and right, either because

¹ Ps. xcix. 8 (Sept.).

³ Matt. vi. 12, 14; Luke xi. 4.

² Prov. iii. 12 (Sept.).

⁴ Matt. xix. 12.

it is unknown to them, or because it is unpleasant to them. For we have the stronger desire for a thing, in proportion to the certainty of our knowledge how good it is, and in proportion to the warmth of satisfaction which that knowledge occasions. Ignorance, therefore, and infirmity are faults which hinder our will from moving either to the performance of a good work, or to the refraining from an evil one. But in order that what was hidden may come to light, and what was unpleasant may become agreeable, the grace of God operates and assists the wills of men. If in any case men are not assisted by it, the reason is equally due to themselves, not to God, whether they be predestinated to condemnation, owing to the iniquity of their pride, or whether they are to be judged contrary to their very pride, and to be disciplined out of the rudeness thereof, if they are children of mercy and grace. Accordingly Jeremiah, after saying, "I know, O Lord, that the way of man is not in himself, and that it belongeth not to any man to walk and direct his steps,"¹ immediately adds, "Correct me, O Lord, but with judgment, and not in Thine anger;"² as much as to say, I know that it is owing to my own fault, and that it is a part of Thy chastisement, that I am not assisted by Thee, that my footsteps should be perfectly directed: but yet do not in this so deal with me as Thou dost in Thine anger, when Thou dost determine to condemn the wicked; but as Thou dost in Thy judgment whereby Thou dost teach Thy children not to be proud and arrogant. Whence in another passage it is said, "And Thy judgments shall help me."³

CHAP. 27.—*The divine remedies against pride; grace pre-eminent in Christ; how it happens that righteousness sometimes affords pleasure more or less, sometimes not.*⁴

You cannot therefore attribute to God the cause of any sin or shortcoming in man. For of all human faults the cause is pride, for the conviction and removal of which a great remedy comes from heaven. God in His mercy humbles Himself, descends from above, and displays to man, lifted up

¹ Jer. x. 23.

² Jer. x. 24.

³ Ps. cxix. 175.

⁴ See below, in ch. 33; also *De Naturâ et Gratia*, 29–32; and *De Corrept. et Gratia*, 10.

in pride, a pure and manifest grace in our own very manhood, which He undertook out of the vast love He bore to those who partake [of this nature] along with Himself. For [Christ] did not undertake this dispensation of grace¹ (uniting Himself so intimately with the Word of God as by the very union to become in one and the same person both Son of God and also Son of man) owing to any merits or claims antecedent to His own will. It behoved Him to be one; if it were possible that there should be two, or three, or more, such a dispensation would not have come from the pure and simple gift of God, but from man's free will and choice. This, then, is what is especially commended to us [in the gospel of God]; this, so far as I dare to think, is the divine lesson taught and learned in those treasures of wisdom and knowledge which are hidden in Christ. Every one of us, therefore, either knows or knows not—either rejoices or rejoices not—to begin, continue, and complete a good work, discovering that it is due not to his own will, but to the gift of God that he either knows or rejoices [to accomplish such a work]. This results in his being cured of the pride and vanity which elated him, and in his knowing how truly it is said not simply of this earth of ours, but in the spiritual sense, “The Lord will give kindness and sweet grace, and our land shall yield her fruit.”² A good work, moreover, affords greater delight, in proportion as God is more and more loved as the highest unchangeable Good, and as the Author of all good things of every kind whatever. And that God may be loved, “His love is shed abroad in our hearts,” not by ourselves, but “by the Holy Ghost that is given unto us.”³

CHAP. 28. [XVIII.]—*A good will comes from God.*

Men, however, are toiling to discover in our own will some good thing of our own,—not given to us by God; but how it is to be found I cannot imagine. The apostle says, when speaking of men's good works, “What hast thou that thou didst not receive? now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?”⁴ But, besides this, even nature itself, which may be taken into the account

¹ Fecit.

² Ps. lxxxv. 12 (Sept.).

³ Rom. v. 5.

⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

by such as we, on such subjects as these, firmly keeps every one of us in our investigations within narrow bounds; forbidding us so to maintain God's grace as to seem to take away free will, or, on the other hand, so to assert its liberty as to lay ourselves open to the censure of being ungrateful to the grace of God, in the arrogance of our impiety.¹

CHAP. 29.—*A subterfuge of the Pelagians.*

Now, with reference to the passage of the apostle which I have quoted, some of them would maintain it to mean that "whatever amount of good inclination a man has, must on this account be attributed to God, because even this amount could not be in him if he were not a human being. Now, inasmuch as he only has from God the capacity of being anything at all, and of being human, why should there not be also attributed to God whatever there is in him of a good will, which could not exist unless he existed in whom it is found?" But on these terms it may also be maintained that a bad and depraved will also comes from God as its author; because even it could not exist in man unless he were a man in whom it existed. Now God is the author of his human existence; He must therefore be the author also of this depraved will, which could have no existence if it had not a man to give it being. But to argue thus is blasphemy.

CHAP. 30.—*A free will is that which is freely bent hither and thither; there are certain good things the use of which cannot be evil; all will is either good, and then it loves righteousness, or evil, when it does not love righteousness.*

Unless, therefore, we obtain not simply a choice of will, which is freely turned in this direction and that, and has its place amongst those natural goods which a man by using wrongly may become evil, but also a good will and desire, which has its place among those good gifts of which it is impossible for us to make a wrong use (unless our having it from God negative the point of possibility to us), I know not how we are to defend the principle expressed [in the apostle's question], "What hast thou that thou didst not receive?" For if we have from God a certain freedom of will, which may still be either a good will or an evil one; and if the good will

¹ See *De Gratiâ Christi*, 52; and *De Gratiâ et Libero Arbitrio*, 1.

comes from ourselves; then that which emanates from ourselves is a better thing than that which proceeds from Him. But inasmuch as it is the height of absurdity to say this, they ought to acknowledge that we learn from God how to acquire even a good will. It would indeed be a strange thing if our will could remain in a certain condition of neutrality,—so as to be neither good nor bad; for we either love righteousness, and then our will is a good one (and if our love for it be greater or less, then our will is more or less good); or else we do not love it at all, and in that case our will is not a good one. For who can hesitate to affirm that, when the will loves not righteousness in any way at all, it is not only a bad, but even a wholly depraved will? Since therefore the will is either good or bad, and since of course we have not the bad will from God, it remains that we have of God a good will; and besides, I know no other gift of His, since our justification is from Him, in which we ought to rejoice. Hence I suppose it is written, “The will is prepared of the Lord;”¹ and in the Psalms, “The steps of a man will be rightly ordered by the Lord, and His way will be the choice of his will;”² and that which the apostle says, “For it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do of His own good pleasure.”³

CHAP. 31.—*Grace is given to some men in mercy; is withheld from others in justice and truth.*

Forasmuch then as our turning away from God is our own act and deed, and this is our depraved will; since also our turning to God is not in our power, except He rouses and helps us, and this is our good will,—what have we that we have not received? And since we are recipients, why do we glory as if we had received nothing? Therefore, as “he that glorieth must glory in the Lord,”⁴ it comes from His grace and mercy that God wills to impart such gifts to some, and from His truth and equity that He wills not to impart them to others. For to sinners punishment is justly due, because “the Lord God loveth mercy and truth,”⁵ and “mercy and truth are met together;”⁶ and “all the paths of the Lord are

¹ [*θελήσις*, Sept.], Prov. viii. 35.

² [*θειλήσει*, Sept.], Ps. xxxvii. 23.

³ Phil. ii. 13.

⁴ Isa. xlv. 25; Jer. ix. 23, 24; 1 Cor. i. 31.

⁵ Ps. lxxxiv. 11 (Septuagint).

⁶ Ps. lxxxv. 10.

mercy and truth."¹ And who can tell the numberless instances in which Holy Scripture combines these two attributes? Sometimes, by a change in the terms, *grace* is put for *mercy*, as in the passage, "We beheld His glory, the glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth."² Sometimes also *judgment* occurs instead of *truth*, as in the passage, "I will sing of mercy and judgment unto Thee, O Lord."³

CHAP. 32.—*Why grace is not given to all men, and not always even to the saints.*

As to the reason why He wills to convert some, and to punish others for turning away from Him, although nobody can justly censure Him for being merciful in conferring His blessing, nor can any man justly find fault with His truthfulness in awarding punishment (as no one could justly blame Him, in the parable of the labourers, for paying to some their stipulated hire, and asserting for others such as had not been agreed on⁴), yet, after all, the purpose of His more hidden judgment lies entirely in His own hand. [XIX.] So far as it has been given us to have wisdom and understanding, the Lord our God—if we are able to form a judgment—is even good in withholding sometimes from His saints either the certain knowledge or the triumphant joy of a good work, that they may discover how it is not from themselves but from Him that they receive the light which illuminates their darkness, and the sweet grace which causes their land⁵ to yield her fruit.

CHAP. 33.—*Through grace we have both the knowledge of good, and the delight which it affords; need of grace to assist us; it is given in mercy, or withheld in judgment; we must, above all things, watch against pride.*

But when we pray Him to give us His help to do and accomplish righteousness, what else do we pray for than that He would open and explain what used to be hidden, and impart sweetness to that which once gave no pleasure? For even this very duty of praying to Him we have learned by His grace, since before we knew no such duty; and by His grace have come to love it, whereas before it gave us no

¹ Ps. xxv. 10.

² John i. 14.

³ Ps. ci. 1.

⁴ Matt. xx. 1-16.

⁵ *i.e.* the soil of their hearts. See above, c. 27.

pleasure,—so that “he who glorieth must glory in the Lord,” and not in himself. To be lifted up, indeed, to pride is the result of men’s own will, not of the operation of God; for to such an emotion God neither urges us nor helps us. There first occurs then in the will of man a certain appetite of its own power, to become disobedient through pride. If it were not for this appetite, indeed, there would be nothing to cause trouble; and whenever man willed it, he might refuse without difficulty. There ensued, however, out of the penalty which was justly due to sin such a flaw and damage [to our moral nature], that henceforth it became difficult to be obedient unto righteousness; and unless this damage were overcome by the assistance of grace, no one would turn to holiness; nor would any one enjoy the peace of righteousness unless the flaw were mended by the operation of grace. But whose grace is it that overcomes and repairs the damage, but His to whom the prayer is directed: “Convert us, O God of our salvation, and turn Thine anger away from us?”¹ And even when He does this, He does it in mercy, so that it is said of Him, “Not according to our sins hath He dealt with us, nor hath He recompensed us according to our iniquities;”² and when He refrains from doing this to any, it is in judgment that He refrains. And who shall say to Him, “What hast Thou done?” when with pious mind the saints sing to His praise of His mercy and judgment? Wherefore even in the case of His saints and faithful servants He applies to them a tardier cure in certain of their failings, in order that, while they are involved in these, a less pleasure than is compatible with the fulfilling of righteousness in all its perfection may be experienced by them at any good they may achieve, whether latent or manifest; so that in respect of His most perfect rule of equity and truth “no man living can be justified in His sight.”³ In His own self, indeed, He wishes none of us to fall under condemnation, but that we should become humble; and He displays to us all the self-same grace of His own. Let us not, however, after we have made trial of its facility in all things, suppose that [virtue] to be our own which is really His; for that would be an error most antagonistic to religion and piety.

¹ Ps. lxxxv. 4.² Ps. ciii. 10.³ Ps. cxliii. 2.

Nor let us think that we should, because of His grace, continue in the same sins as of old; but against that very pride, which causes us our humiliation so long as we continue in them, let us, above all things, both vigilantly strive and ardently seek His help, knowing at the same time that it is by His gift that we have the power thus to strive and thus to pray; so that in every case, while we look not at ourselves, but raise our hearts above, we may render thanks to the Lord our God, and whenever we glory, glory in Him alone.

CHAP. 34. [XX.]—*He answers the fourth question proposed: That no man, with the exception of Christ, has ever lived, or can live without sin.*¹

There now remains our fourth point, after the explanation of which, as God shall help us, this lengthened treatise of ours may at last be brought to an end. It is this: Whether the man who has never sinned at all, or never can sin, is not only now living as one of the sons of men, but also could ever have existed at any time, or will yet in time to come exist? Now it is altogether most certain that such a man neither does now live, nor has lived, nor ever will live, except the one only Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus. We have already said a good deal on this subject in our remarks on the baptism of infants; for if these have no sin, not only are there at present, but also there have been, and there will be, persons innumerable without sin. Now if the point which we treated of under the second head be truly substantiated, that there is in fact no man without sin, then of course not even infants are without sin. From which the conclusion arises, that even supposing a man could possibly exist in the present life so far advanced in virtue as to have reached the perfect fulness of holy living which is absolutely free from sin, he still must have been undoubtedly a sinner previously, and have been converted from the sinful state to this subsequent newness of life. Now when we were discussing the second head, a different question was before us from that which is before us under this fourth head. For then the point we had to consider was, Whether any man in this life could ever attain to such perfection as to be absolutely without sin by the grace of God, by the hearty desire of his own will? whereas the question now

¹ See above, c. 8.

proposed in this fourth place is, Whether there be among the sons of men, or could possibly ever have been, or yet ever could be, a man who has not indeed emerged out of sin and attained to perfect holiness, but has never, at any time whatever, been under the bondage of sin? If, therefore, the remarks are true which we have made at so great length concerning infants, there neither is, has been, nor will be, among the sons of men any man, except the one Mediator, in whom there accrues to us that propitiation and justification through which we have reconciliation with God, by putting an end to the enmity produced by our sins. It will therefore be not unsuitable to retrace a few considerations, so far as the present subject seems to require, from the very commencement of the human race, in order that they may inform and strengthen the reader's mind in answer to some objections which may possibly disturb him.

CHAP. 35. [XXI.]—*Adam and Eve; the tree of knowledge of good and evil, why so called; Adam, previous to his fall, made use of the tree of life; the tree of life a type of wisdom; a paradise for the body and for the soul; obedience most strongly enjoined by God on man.*

When the first human pair—the man Adam, and his wife Eve who came out of him—willed no longer to obey the commandment which they had received from God, a just and deserved punishment overtook them. The Lord had threatened that, on the day they dared to eat the forbidden fruit, they should surely die.¹ Now, inasmuch as they had received the permission of using for food every tree that grew in Paradise, among which God had planted the tree of life; but since He had forbidden them to partake of one only tree, which He called the tree of knowledge of good and evil, to signify by this name the consequence of their discovering both what good they would experience if they kept the prohibition, and what evil if they transgressed it, they are no doubt rightly considered to have abstained from the forbidden food previous to the malignant advice of the devil, and to have used all the aliments which had been allowed them, and therefore, among all the others, and before all the others, the tree of life. For what could be more absurd than to suppose that they partook of the fruit of other trees, but not of that which had been

¹ Gen. ii. 17.

equally with others granted to them, and which, by its extreme virtue, prevented even their animal bodies from undergoing change through the decay of age, and from dying at last through very decrepitude, applying this benefit from its own body to the man's body, and in a mystery demonstrating what, by virtue of the wisdom which it symbolized, it conferred on the rational soul, even that it should be quickened by its fruit, and not be changed into a worthless state of decay and death? For of her it is rightly said, "She is a tree of life to them that lay hold of her."¹ The one was a tree for the bodily Paradise, the other for the spiritual; the one afforded vigour to the senses of the outward man, the other strength to those of the inner man,—a vital strength and vigour, without any change for the worse through lapse of time. They therefore serve God, that dutiful obedience being all along commended to them, whereby alone God can be worshipped. Now, however great [this tree] was in itself, and however efficient by itself alone to guard and preserve the rational creature under the Creator, it was yet impossible for it to be put to any higher use than that these rational creatures should by it be prohibited from a tree which had no inherent evil. For God forbid that the Creator of all good, who made all things, "and behold they were very good,"² should plant anything evil amidst the fertility of even that material Paradise. Still, however, it was well to show man, whose submission to such a Master was so very useful to him, how much good belonged simply to the obedience, which was all that He had demanded of His servant. This obedience would find its account not so much in the lordship of the Master as in the advantage of the servant. They were in fact forbidden the use of a tree, which, if it had not been for the prohibition, they might have used without suffering any evil result whatever; and from this circumstance it may be clearly understood, that whatever evil they brought on themselves because they made use of it in spite of the prohibition, the tree did not produce it to their detriment from any noxious or pernicious quality in its fruit, but entirely from the fact of their violated obedience.

¹ Prov. iii. 18.

² Gen. i. 31.

CHAP. 36. [XXII.]—*Man's state before the fall ; why the members of human generation are called "pudenda ;" sin dwelling in our members ; the "opening of their eyes," what this meant in our first parents.*

Before they had thus violated their obedience they were pleasing to God, and God was pleasant to them ; and though they carried about an animal body, they yet perceived in it no incentive moving them to disobedience. This was the righteous appointment [of the Creator,] that inasmuch as their soul had received from the Lord a body for its servant, so it should itself obey the same Lord as its Master, even as its own body was obedient to itself, and should exhibit a service suitable to the life given it without resistance. Hence "they were both naked, and were not ashamed."¹ It is with a natural instinct of shame that the rational soul is now indeed affected, because in that flesh, whose service it had once received as the just due of its own superior power, it can no longer, owing to some indescribable infirmity, prevent the motion of the members thereof, notwithstanding its own unwillingness, nor excite them to motion even when it wishes. Now these members are on this account, in every man of chastity, rightly called "*pudenda*" [such as cause him shame], because they excite themselves, just as they like, in opposition to the mind which is their master, as if they were in fact their own masters ; and the sole authority which the bridle of virtue possesses over them is to check them from approaching impure and unlawful pollutions. Such disobedience of the flesh as this, which lies in the very excitement, even when it is not allowed to take effect, did not exist in the first man and woman whilst they were naked and not ashamed. For as yet the rational soul, which rules the flesh, had not developed such a disobedience to its Lord, as by a reciprocity of punishment to bring on itself the rebellion of its own servant the flesh, along with that feeling of confusion and trouble to itself which it certainly failed to inflict upon God by its own disobedience to Him ; for God is put to no shame or trouble when we do not obey Him, nor are we able in any wise to lessen His very great power over us ; but on ourselves shame is caused, whenever the flesh is not submissive to our command,—a result which is brought

¹ Gen. ii. 25.

about by the infirmity which we incur by sinning, and is called "the sin which dwelleth in our members."¹ But this sin is of such a character that it becomes the chastisement of sin. As soon, indeed, as the transgression has been effected, and the soul in its disobedience has turned away from the law of its Lord, then its servant, the body, begins to put in force the law of disobedience against it; and then the man and the woman grew ashamed of their nakedness, when they perceived the rebellious motion of the flesh, which they had not perceived before. This discovery is called "the opening of their eyes;"² for no longer did they walk about among the trees with closed eyes. The same thing is said of Hagar: "Her eyes were opened, and she saw a well."³ Then the man and the woman covered their loins. God had given them to them as useful members; they made them "pudenda," parts which caused them shame.

CHAP. 37. [XXIII.]—*Sin is the corruption of nature, its renovation is by Christ; man's original righteousness in Paradise, his righteousness after the fall.*

From this law of sin comes that sinful flesh, which requires cleansing through the mystery of Him who came in the likeness of sinful flesh, that the body of sin might be destroyed, which is also called "the body of this death," from which only God's grace delivers wretched man through Jesus Christ our Lord.⁴ For this law, which originated death, passed on from the first pair to their posterity, as [is attested by] the labour with which all men toil on earth, and the travail which affects mothers with the pains of childbirth. These sufferings they brought on themselves according to the sentence of God, when they were convicted of sin; and we see them accomplished, not only in them, but also in their descendants, in some more, in others less. Whereas, however, the primeval righteousness of the first human beings consisted in obeying God, and not having in their members the law of concupiscence operating against the law of their mind; now, since their fall, in our sinful flesh which is born of them, it is obtained by those who obey God as a great acquisition that they do not obey the desires of this evil concupiscence, but crucify in themselves the flesh with its affections and lusts, that they may be Jesus

¹ Rom. vii. 17, 23.

² Gen. iii. 7.

³ Gen. xxi. 19.

⁴ Rom. vii. 24, 25.

Christ's, who on His cross figured this crucifixion, and who gave them power through His grace to become the sons of God. For it is not to all men, but to as many as have received Him, that He has given to be born again to God of the Spirit, after their natural birth in the flesh. Of these indeed it is written: "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God; which were born, not of the flesh, nor of blood, nor of the will of man, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God."¹

CHAP. 38. [XXIV.]—*What benefit has been conferred on us by the incarnation of the Word; Christ's birth in the flesh, wherein it is like and wherein unlike our own birth.*

He goes on to add, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;"² as much as to say, A great thing indeed has been done among them, even that they are born again to God of God, who had before been born of the flesh to the world, although created by God Himself; but far more wonderful is the fact that, whereas it accrued to them by nature to be born of the flesh, but by the divine goodness to be born of God, in order that so great a benefit might be imparted to them, He who was in His own nature the Son of God, vouchsafed in mercy to be also born of the flesh,—no less being meant by the passage, "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." Hereby, he says in effect, it has come to pass that we who were born of the flesh as flesh, by being afterwards born of the Spirit, became spirit and dwelt in God; because God, who was born of God, by being afterwards born of the flesh, became flesh, and dwelt among us. For the Word, which became flesh, was in the beginning, and was God with God.³ But at the same time His condescending to our inferior condition, and sharing in it, in order to our participation in His higher state, has always occupied a kind of intermediate position⁴ even in His birth of the flesh. Whilst we indeed were born in sinful flesh, He was born in the likeness of sinful flesh; whilst we were born not only of flesh and blood, but also of the will of man, and of the will of the flesh, He was born only of flesh and blood, not of the will of man, nor of the will of the flesh, but of God. We, therefore, [were born] to

¹ John i. 12, 13.

² John i. 14.

³ John i. 1.

⁴ Medietatem.

die on account of sin ; He, on our account, [was born] to die without sin. Moreover, just as His inferior circumstances, to which He lowered Himself to reach us, were not in every particular exactly on a par with our inferior condition, in which He found us here ; so our superior state, in which we mount up to God, will not be quite equal to His superior state, in which we are there to find Him by and by. For we by His grace are to be made the sons of God, whereas He was evermore by nature the Son of God ; we having been once converted shall cleave to God, though not as His equal ; He who never turned from God, remains ever equal to God ; we are partakers of eternal life, He is eternal life. He, therefore, alone having become man, but still continuing to be God, never had any sin, nor did He assume a flesh of sin, although born of His mother's¹ sinful flesh. For what He then took of flesh, He either cleansed in order to take it, or cleansed by taking it. His virgin mother, therefore, whose conception was not according to the law of sinful flesh (in other words, not by the excitement of carnal concupiscence), but who merited by her piety and faith the formation within her of the holy seed, He formed in order to select her [as His parent,] and selected her in order to be formed in her and of her. How much more needful, then, is it for sinful flesh to be baptized in order to escape the judgment, when the flesh which was untainted by sin was baptized to set an example for imitation ?

CHAP. 39. [XXV.]—*An objection of the Pelagians.*

The answer, which we have already given,² to those who say, " If a sinner has begotten a sinner, a righteous man ought also to have begotten a righteous man," we now advance in reply to such as argue that one who is born of a baptized man ought himself to be regarded as already baptized. " For why," they ask, " could he not have been baptized in the loins of his father, when, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Levi³ was able to pay tithes in the loins of Abraham ?" They who

¹ De *maternâ* carne peccati. Another reading has, De *naturâ* carnis peccati (" of the nature of sinful flesh "); and a third, De *materiâ* carnis peccati (" of the matter of sinful flesh ").

² See above, c. 11.

³ The allusion is to Heb. vii. 9.

propose this argument ought to observe that Levi did not subsequently pay tithes because he had paid tithes already in the loins of Abraham, but because he was ordained to the office of the priesthood in order to receive tithes, not to pay them; otherwise not even his brethren, who all used to contribute their tithes to him, would have to make such payments, because they too, whilst in the loins of Abraham, had paid tithes to Melchisedec.

CHAP. 40.—*An argument anticipated.*

And let no one contend that the descendants of Abraham might fairly enough have paid tithes, although they had already paid tithes in the loins of their forefather, on the ground that paying tithes was an obligation of such a nature as to require constant repetition from each several person, as was the case with the Israelites, who used to pay such contributions year by year all through life to their Levites, to whom were due various tithes from all kinds of produce; whereas baptism is a sacrament of such a nature as admits of no repetition,—it is administered once for all. And if a man had already received it when in his father [according to the supposition], he must be considered as no other than baptized, since he was born of a man who had been himself baptized. Well, whoever thus argues (I will simply say, without discussing the point at length), should look at circumcision. This used to be administered once for all, but yet it must be dispensed to each person separately and individually. [And the cases are strictly parallel.] For as it was necessary in the time of that ancient sacrament for the son of a circumcised man to be himself circumcised, so now the son of one who has been baptized must himself also receive baptism.

CHAP. 41.—*Children are called “clean” [or holy] by the apostle when one or the other of their parents was a believer.*¹

The apostle indeed says, “Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy;”² and therefore they infer there was no necessity for the children of believers to be baptized. I am surprised at the use of such language by persons who

¹ [See Gelasius, in his *Treatise against the Pelagians.*]

² 1 Cor. vii. 14.

deny that original sin has been transmitted from Adam. If they take this passage of the apostle to mean that the children of believers are born in a state of holiness, how is it that they actually have no doubt about the necessity of even these children being baptized? Why, in short, do they refuse to admit that any original sin is derived from a sinful parent, if any holiness is received from a holy parent? Now it does not contravene any assertion on our side, indeed, even if "holy" children are [said to be] born of believing parents, because we also hold that unless children are baptized they are in danger of¹ damnation; and even our opponents exclude them from the kingdom of heaven, although they insist that they are without sin, whether actual or original.² Now, if they think it an unbecoming thing for beings who are "*holy*" to incur damnation, how can it be a proper thing to exclude them, "holy" as they are, from the kingdom of God? They should pay especial attention to this point, How can a sinful state help being derived from sinful parents, if a holy state is derived from holy parents, and an unclean state from unclean parents? For the twofold principle was affirmed [by the apostle] when he said, "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy." They should also explain to us how it is right that the holy children of believers and the unclean children of unbelievers are, notwithstanding their different circumstances, equally prohibited from entering the kingdom of God, if they have not been baptized. What avails that sanctity of theirs in the former class? Now if they were to maintain that the unclean children of unbelievers are damned, but that the holy children of believers are not damned, because they are "holy,"—although they are unable to enter the kingdom of heaven unless they are baptized,—that would be a distinction so far as it went; but as it is, they declare with an equal amount of assurance respecting the holy children of holy parents and the unclean offspring of unclean parents, that they are not damned, since they have not any sin; and that they are excluded from the kingdom of God because they are unbaptized. What an absurdity! Who can suppose that such splendid geniuses do not perceive it?

¹ Pergere in.

² See above, Book I. ch. 21-23.

CHAP. 42.—*Sanctification manifold ; sacrament of catechumens.*

Our opinions on this point are strictly in unison with the apostle's himself, who said, "From one all are exposed to condemnation," and "from One all to justification of life."¹ Now how consistent these statements are with what he elsewhere says, when treating of another point, "Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy," consider awhile. [xxvi.] Holiness or sanctification is not of merely one mode ; for even catechumens, I take it, are sanctified in a manner suitable to them by the sign of Christ, and His prayer and imposition of hand ; and what they receive is holy, although it is not the body of Christ,—holier, indeed, than any food which constitutes our ordinary nourishment, because it is a sacrament.² However, that very meat and drink, wherewithal the necessities of our present life are sustained, are, according to the same apostle, "sanctified by the word of God and prayer,"³ even the prayer with which we beg that our bodies may be refreshed. [And here arises an argument from analogy ;] for as this sanctification of our ordinary food does not hinder what enters the mouth from descending into the belly, and being ejected into the draught,⁴ and partaking of the corruption into which everything earthly is resolved, whence the Lord exhorts us to labour for the food which never perishes,⁵ so the sanctification of the catechumen, if he is not baptized, does not avail for his entrance into the kingdom of heaven, nor for the remission of his sins. And, by parity of reasoning, that sanctification likewise, of whatever kind it be, which, according to the apostle, is inherent in the children of believers, has nothing whatever to do with the question of baptism and of original sin, or the remission thereof.⁶ The apostle, in this very passage which has occupied our attention,

¹ See Rom. v. 18.

² Catechumens received the *sacramentum salis*—salt placed in the mouth—with other rites, such as exorcism and the sign of the cross ; the Lord's Prayer and other invocations concluding the ceremony. See Canon 5 of the third Council of Carthage ; also Augustine's *De Catechiz. Rud.* 50 ; and his *Confess.* i. 11, where (speaking of his own catechumenical course) he says : "I was now signed with the sign of His cross, and was *seasoned with His salt.*"

³ 1 Tim. iv. 5.

⁴ Mark vii. 19.

⁵ John vi. 27.

⁶ See below, Book III. chap. 21 ; and his *Sermons*, xxix. 4.

says that the unbeliever of a married couple is sanctified by a believing partner. His words are: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband. Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy."¹ Now, I should say, there is not a man whose mind is so warped by unbelief, as to suppose that, whatever sense he gives to these words, they can possibly mean that a husband who is not a Christian should not be baptized because his wife is a Christian, and that he has already obtained remission of his sins, with the certain prospect of entering the kingdom of heaven, because he is described as being sanctified by his wife.

CHAP. 43. [XXVII.]

If any man, however, is still perplexed by the question why the children of baptized persons are baptized, let him briefly consider this: Inasmuch as through the one man, Adam, the generation of sinful flesh draws into condemnation all who are born of such generation, so the generation of the Spirit of grace through the one man Jesus Christ, draws to the justification of eternal life all who partake of this regeneration to which they are predestinated. But the sacrament of baptism is undoubtedly the sacrament of regeneration. Wherefore, as the man who has never lived cannot die, and he who has never died cannot rise again, so he who has never been born cannot be born again. From which the conclusion arises, that no man who has not been born could possibly have been born again in his father. Born again, however, a man must of necessity be, if he has ever been born; because, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."² Even an infant, therefore, must be immersed in the sacrament of regeneration, or without it his would be an unhappy exit out of this life; and this baptism is administered solely for the remission of sins. And so much does Christ show us in this very passage; for when asked, How could such things be? He reminded His questioner of what Moses did when he lifted up the serpent. Inasmuch, then, as infants are by the sacrament of baptism conformed to the death of

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 14.² John iii. 3.

Christ, it must be admitted that they are also freed from the serpent's poisonous bite, unless we wilfully wander from the rule of the Christian faith. This bite, however, they did not receive in their own actual life, but in and through him on whom the wound was primarily inflicted.

CHAP. 44.—*An objection of the Pelagians.*

Nor do they fail to see this point, that his own sins are no detriment to the parent after his conversion; they therefore raise the occurrent question: "How much more impossible is it that they should be a hindrance to his son?" But they who thus think do not attend to this consideration, that as his own sins are not injurious to the father for the very reason that he is born again of the Spirit, so in the case of his son, unless he be in the same manner born again, the sins which he derived from his father will prove injurious to him. Because even regenerate parents beget children, not from the first-fruits of their renewed condition, but carnally from the remains of the old nature; and the children who are thus the offspring of their parents' remaining old nature, and are born in sinful flesh, escape from the condemnation which is due to the old man by the sacrament of spiritual regeneration and renewal. Now this is a consideration which, on account of the controversies that have arisen, and may still arise, on this subject, we ought to keep in our view and memory,—that a plenary and perfect remission of sins takes place only in baptism, that the character of the actual man does not at once undergo a total change, but that the first-fruits of the Spirit in such as walk worthily change the old carnal nature into one of like character by a process of renewal, which increases day by day, until the entire old nature is so renovated that the very weakness of the natural body attains to the strength and incorruptibility of the spiritual body.

CHAP. 45. [XXVIII.]—*The law of sin is called sin; concupiscence still remains after its evil has been removed in the baptized; how this happens; the being in the flesh; the guilt of concupiscence is done away by baptism, though the concupiscence remains.*

This law of sin, however, which the apostle also designates "sin," when he says, "Let not *sin* therefore reign in your

mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof,"¹ does not remain in the members of those who are born again of water and the Spirit, in such a way as if there were no remission thereof, because there is a full and perfect remission of our sins, all the enmity being slain, which separated us from God; but it remains in our old carnal nature, as overcome and destroyed, so long as it does not, by consenting to unlawful objects, spring to life again, and call itself back to its proper reign and dominion. There is, however, so clear a distinction to be seen between this old carnal nature, in which the law of sin (or sin) is already repealed, and that life of the Spirit, in the newness of which they who are baptized are through God's grace born again, that the apostle deemed it inadequate to say of such that they were not in sin; but he went so far as to describe them as not being in the flesh itself, even before they departed out of this mortal life. "They that are in the flesh," says he, "cannot please God; but ye *are not in the flesh*, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you."² And indeed, as they turn to good account the flesh itself, however corruptible it be, who apply its members to good works, and in that flesh no longer are, since they do not mould their understanding nor their life according to its principles; and as they in like manner make even a good use of death, which is the penalty of the first sin, who encounter it with fortitude and patience for their brethren's sake, and for the faith, and in defence of whatever is true and holy and just,—so also do all "true yokefellows" in the faith turn to good account that very law of sin which still remains, though remitted, in their old carnal nature, who, from their having the new life of Christ, do not permit lust to have dominion over them. And yet these very persons, from the fact of their still carrying about Adam's old nature, continue after the manner of mortal man to beget children with a progeny of sin, who require regeneration to attain immortality; [and this they may attain,] because such as are born again are not tied and bound by the sin in which they are born, and from which they that are born in it are loosened by being born again. As long, then, as the law of sin by concupi-

¹ Rom. vi. 12.² Rom. viii. 8, 9.

scence¹ dwells in the members, although the concupiscence remains, the guilt of it is dissoluble, but [only] to him who has received the sacrament of regeneration, and is entering upon newness of life. Whatsoever is born of the old nature, which still abides with its concupiscence, requires to be born again in order to be healed. Granting that believing parents, who have been both carnally born and spiritually regenerated, have themselves begotten children in a carnal manner, how could their children by any possibility, previous to their first birth, have been born again ?

CHAP. 46.—[Compare Augustine's BOOK VI. against Julianus, c. 22.]

You must not be surprised at what I have said, that although the law of sin remains with its concupiscence, the guilt thereof is done away through the grace of the sacrament. For as wicked deeds, and words, and thoughts have already passed away, and cease to exist, so far as regards the mere movements of the mind and the body, and yet their guilt remains after they have passed away and become non-existent, unless it be done away by the remission of sins ; so, contrariwise, in this not yet preterite but still abiding law of concupiscence, its guilt is done away, and continues no longer, since in baptism there takes place a full forgiveness of sins. Indeed, if a man were to quit this present life immediately after his baptism, there would be nothing at all left to keep him bound, inasmuch as all bonds which held him are loosened. As, on the one hand, therefore, there is nothing strange in the fact that the guilt of past sins of thought, and word, and deed remains before their remission ; so, on the other hand, there ought to be nothing to create surprise, that the guilt of remaining concupiscence passes away after the remission of sins.

CHAP. 47. [XXIX.]—*All the predestinated are saved through the one Mediator Christ, and by one only faith.*

This being the case, ever since the time when by one man sin thus entered into the world and death by sin, and death in this way passed through to all men, up to the close of the generations of the flesh and this perishing

¹ We follow the reading, *lex [scil. peccati] concupiscentialiter*, etc.

world, the children of which beget and are begotten, there never has existed, nor ever will exist, a human being of whom, while placed in this life of ours, it could be said that he had no sin at all, with the exception of the one Mediator, who reconciles us to our Maker through the forgiveness of sins. Now this same Mediator, our Lord Himself, has never yet refused, at any period of the human race, nor to the last judgment will He ever refuse, this healing grace of His to those whom, in His most sure foreknowledge and promised¹ loving-kindness, He has predestinated to reign with Himself to life eternal. For, previous to His birth in the flesh, and His suffering in infirmity, and rising again in power, He instructed all who then lived, in the faith of those then *future* blessings, that they might inherit everlasting life; whilst those who were alive when all these things were being accomplished in Christ, and who were witnessing the fulfilment of prophecy, He impressed with the belief of their *present* reality; whilst again, those who have since lived, and ourselves who are now alive, and all those who are yet to live, He likewise informs without ceasing, and will inform, in the faith of these great *past* events. It is therefore "one faith" which saves all, who after their carnal birth are born again of the Spirit, having its end in Him, who came to be judged for us and to die,—the Judge of quick and dead. But this one faith undergoes change at various times, in sacraments fitted to express its signification by suitable methods.

CHAP. 48.—*Christ the Saviour even of infants; Christ, when an infant, was free from the ignorance and mental weakness of that stage of life; Christ's flesh would seem to have been liable to death even by growing old.*

He is therefore actually the Saviour at once of infants and of adults, of whom the angel said, "There is born unto you this day a Saviour;"² and concerning whom it was declared to the Virgin Mary,³ "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins," where it is plainly shown that He was called Jesus because of the salvation which He bestows upon us,—Jesus being tantamount to the Latin *Salvator*, "Saviour." Who then can be so bold as to

¹ Futuram.

² Luke ii. 11.

³ Rather to Joseph, Mary's husband; Matt. i. 21.

maintain that the Lord Christ is *Jesus* only for adults and not for infants also? Coming in the likeness of sinful flesh, to destroy the body of sin, with infants' limbs fitted and suitable for no use in the extreme weakness of such body, and His rational soul oppressed with miserable ignorance! Now that such ignorance existed [in such a way as is here suggested,] I cannot suppose in the infant in whom the Word was made flesh, that He might dwell among us; nor can I imagine that such weakness of the mental faculty ever existed in the infant Christ which we see in infants generally. It is owing to such infirmity and ignorance that infants are disturbed with unaccountable fits of restlessness, and are restrained by no rational command or rule, but by pains and penalties, or the terror of such. From this you can quite see what happens in the case of the children of that disobedience, which excites itself in the members of our body in opposition to the law of the mind,—how it refuses to be still, even when the reason wishes; nay, how it is either repressed by some actual infliction of bodily pain, as for instance by flogging; or is checked by producing fear, or by some such mental emotion, but not by any precept of the will. Inasmuch, however, as in Him there was the likeness of sinful flesh, He willed to pass through the changes of the various stages of life, beginning even with infancy, so that it would seem as if that flesh of His might have arrived at death by the gradual approach of old age, if He had not been killed when a young man. Since, however, the death which is inflicted on sinful flesh is owing to disobedience, in His case it was undergone in the likeness of sinful flesh, because of His voluntary obedience. For when He was on His way to it, and was soon to suffer it, He said, "Behold, the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in me. But that all may know that I am doing my Father's will, arise, let us go hence."¹ Having said these words, He went straightway, and encountered His undeserved death, having become obedient even unto death.

CHAP. 49. [XXX.]—*An objection of the Pelagians.*

They therefore who say, "If through the sin of the first man it has come to pass that we must die, by the coming of

¹ John xiv. 30, 31.

Christ it must needs happen that, being believers in Him, we shall not die;" and they add what they deem a reason, saying, "For the sin of the first transgressor could not possibly have injured us more than the incarnation or redemption of the Saviour has benefited us." But why do they not rather give an attentive ear, and an unhesitating belief, to that which the apostle has stated so unambiguously: "Since by man came death, by Man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive?"¹ It is of no other subject that he spoke than of the resurrection of the body. Having said that the bodily death of all men has come about through one man, he adds the promise that the bodily resurrection of all men to eternal life shall happen through one, even Christ. How can it therefore be that "the one has injured us more by sinning than the other has benefited us by redeeming," when by the sin of the former we die a temporal death, but by the redemption of the latter we rise again not to a temporal, but to an eternal life? Our body, therefore, is dead because of sin, but Christ's body only died without sin, in order that, having poured out His blood without fault or sin, "the handwriting" which contains the register of all men's sins "might be blotted out."² While their debts were inscribed in this, they who now believe in Him were formerly held in bondage by the devil. And accordingly He says, "This is my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."³

CHAP. 50. [XXXI.]—*Why it is that death itself is not abolished, along with sin, by baptism.*

He might, however, have also conferred this upon believers, that they should escape even the experience of the death of their body. But if He had done this, there might no doubt have been added a certain felicity to the flesh, but the fortitude of faith would have been diminished; for men have such a fear of death, that they would insist on Christians being happy, because of their mere immunity from dying. No one in the case now supposed would, for the sake of that life which is to be so happy after death, be forward in possessing the grace of Christ by virtue of despising even death itself;

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

² Col. ii. 14.

³ Matt. xxvi. 28.

he would rather resort to a more delicate and easy mode of believing in Christ, with a view to remove the trouble and difficulty of death. More grace, therefore, than this has He conferred on those who believe on Him; and a greater gift, undoubtedly, has He vouchsafed to them! What great matter would it have been for a man, on seeing that people did not die when they became believers, himself also to believe that he was not to die? How much greater a thing is it, how much braver, how much more laudable, so to believe, that although one is sure to die, he can still hope to live hereafter for evermore! Indeed, upon some there will be bestowed this blessing at the last day, that they shall not perceive the actual suffering of death in the suddenness of the change which shall happen to them, but they shall be caught up along with the risen in the clouds to meet Christ in the air, and so shall they ever live with the Lord.¹ And rightly shall it befall those whose belief is actuated by this nobler principle; they shall escape the degradation of those who shall deserve the lower place for not hoping for what they see not, while loving what they see. This weak and nerveless faith must not be called faith at all, inasmuch as faith indeed is thus defined: "Faith is the firmness of those who hope,² the clear proof of things which they do not see."³ Accordingly, in the same Epistle to the Hebrews, where this passage occurs, after enumerating in subsequent sentences certain worthies who pleased God by their faith, he says: "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but seeing them afar off, and hailing them, and confessing that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth."⁴ And then afterwards he concluded his eulogy on faith in these words: "And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, did not indeed receive God's promises; for they foresaw better things for us, and that without us they could not themselves become perfect."⁵ Now this would

¹ 1 Thess. iv. 17.

² Augustine constantly quotes this text with the active participle *sperantium*, instead of *sperandorum*. The Greek ἐλπίζομένων is not always construed passively in the passage; some regard it as of the middle voice.

³ Heb. xi. 1.

⁴ Heb. xi. 13.

⁵ Heb. xi. 39, 40.

be no praise for faith, nor (as I said) would it be faith at all, were men in believing to follow after rewards which they could see,—in other words, if on believers were bestowed the reward of immortality in this present world.

CHAP. 51.—*Why the devil is said to hold the power and dominion of death.*

Hence the Lord Himself willed to die, “in order that,” as it is written of Him, “through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.”¹ From this passage it is shown with sufficient clearness that even the death of the body came about at the instigation and authority of the devil,—in a word, from the sin which he persuaded man to commit; nor is there any other reason why he should be said in strictness of truth to hold the power of death. Accordingly, He who died without any sin, original or actual, said in the passage I have already quoted: “Behold, the prince of this world,” that is, the devil, who had the power of death, “and hath nothing in me,”—meaning, he shall find no sin in me, because of which he has caused men to die. As if the question were asked Him: Why then should you die? He says, “That all may know that I am doing my Father’s will; arise, let us go hence.”² That is, [let us go hence] that I may die, though I have no cause of death from sin under the author of sin, but only from obedience and righteousness having become obedient unto death. Proof is likewise afforded us by this passage, that the fact of the faithful overcoming the fear of death is a part of the struggle of faith itself; for all struggle would indeed be at an end, if immortality were at once to become the reward of them that believe.

CHAP. 52. [XXXII.]—*Why Christ, after His resurrection, withdrew His presence from the world.*

However many were the miracles which the Lord visibly wrought, in order that faith might sprout at first and be fed by infant nourishment, and grow to its full strength by and by after this tender treatment (for faith becomes stronger the more it foregoes the help of those [visible proofs]), He still

¹ Heb. ii. 14.

² John xiv. 30, 31.

wished us to wait quietly, without visible inducements, for the promised hope, that the just might live by faith;¹ and so great was this wish of His, that though He rose from the dead the third day, He did not desire even to remain among men, but, after leaving a proof of His resurrection by showing Himself in the flesh to those whom He deigned to have for His witnesses of the great event, He ascended into heaven, withdrawing Himself even from their sight, and no longer conferring on the flesh of any one of them such [a quickening] as He had displayed in His own flesh, in order that they too might live by faith, and in the present world might wait in patience and without visible inducements for the reward of that righteousness in which men live by faith,—a reward which should hereafter be visibly and openly bestowed. To this view and purpose I believe that passage must be referred which He speaks concerning the Holy Ghost: “He will not come, unless I depart.”² For this was in fact saying, Ye shall not be able to live that life of faith, which ye shall have as a gift of mine,—that is, from the Holy Ghost,—unless I withdraw from your eyes that which ye now gaze upon, in order that your heart may advance in spiritual growth by fixing its faith on invisible things. This righteousness of faith He constantly commends to them. Speaking of the Holy Ghost, He says, “He shall reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they have not believed on me: of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye shall see me no more.”³ What is that righteousness, whereby men were not to see Him, except as the just man who lived by faith? and the hope of which we were to cherish by the Spirit in faith,—not looking at the things which are seen, but at those which are not seen?

CHAP. 53. [XXXIII.]—*An objection of the Pelagians.*

But those persons who say, “If the death of the body has happened by sin, we of course ought not to die after that remission of sins which the Redeemer has bestowed upon us,” do not understand how it is that some things, whose guilt God has cancelled and hindered from standing in our way

¹ Hab. ii. 4.

² John xvi. 7.

³ John xvi. 8-10.

after this life, He yet permits to remain in the contest of faith, in order that they may become the means of instructing and exercising those who are advancing in the struggle after holiness. Might not some man, by not understanding this, raise a question and ask, Since God has said to man because of his sin, "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat thy bread: thorns also and thistles shall the ground bring forth to thee,"¹ how comes it to pass that this labour and toil continues since the remission of sins, and that the ground of believers yields them this rough and terrible harvest? Again, since it was said to the woman in consequence of her sin, "In sorrow shalt thou bring forth children,"² how is it that believing women, notwithstanding the remission of their sins, suffer the same pains in the process of parturition? But it is an incontestable fact, that by reason of the sin which they had committed, the primeval man and woman heard these sentences pronounced by God, and deserved them; nor is any opposition shown to these words of the sacred volume, which I have quoted about man's labour and woman's travail, except by the man who is utterly hostile to the Catholic faith, and an adversary to the inspired writings.

CHAP. 54. [XXXIV.]—*Why punishment is still inflicted, after sin has been forgiven.*

But, inasmuch as there are not wanting persons of such character, just as we say in answer to those who raise this question, that the punishments of sins are as such before remission, whereas after remission they become trials and trainings of the righteous; so again to such persons as are similarly perplexed about the death of the body, our answer ought to be so drawn as to show both that we acknowledge the said death to have accrued because of sin, and that we are not discouraged by the punishment of sins having been bequeathed to us for an exercise of discipline, in order that our great fear of it may be overcome by us as we advance in holiness. For if only small virtue accrued to "the faith which worketh by love" to conquer the fear of death, there would be no great glory for the martyrs; nor could the Lord say, "Greater love hath no man than this, that he lay

¹ Gen. iii. 18, 19.

² Gen. iii. 16.

down his life for his friends ;”¹ which John in his epistle expresses in these terms : “ As He laid down His life for us, so ought we to lay down our lives for the brethren.”² In vain, therefore, would commendation be bestowed on the most eminent suffering in encountering or despising death for righteousness’ sake, if there were not in death itself a really great and very severe trial. And the man who overcomes the fear of it by his faith, procures a great renown and just recompense even for his faith itself. Wherefore it ought to surprise no one, that the death of the body could not possibly have happened to man unless sin had been previously committed, of which it was to become even the penal consequence ; and that after the remission of their sins it happens to the faithful, in order that in their triumphing over the fear of it, it may afford them opportunity of exhibiting holiness with fortitude.

CHAP. 55.—*To recover the righteousness which had been lost by sin, man has to struggle hard, with abundant labour and sorrow.*

The flesh which was originally created was not that sinful flesh in which man refused to maintain his holiness amidst the enticements of Paradise ; whence God determined that sinful flesh should propagate itself after it had sinned, and have to struggle hard for the recovery of holiness, by many toils and troubles. Therefore, after Adam was driven out of Paradise, he had to dwell over against Eden,—that is, over against the garden of delights,—to indicate that it is by labours and sorrows, which are the very contraries of delights, that sinful flesh had to be educated, after it had failed amidst its first pleasures to maintain its holiness, previous to its becoming sinful flesh. As therefore our first parents, by their subsequent return to holy living, whence they are fairly supposed to have been released from the worst penalty of their sentence by the blood of [Christ, their] Lord, were still not deemed worthy to be recalled to Paradise during their life on earth, so in like manner our sinful flesh, even if a man lead a righteous life in it after the remission of his sins, does not deserve to be immediately exempted from that death which it has derived from its propagation of sin.³

¹ John xv. 13.

² 1 John iii. 16.

³ See also his treatise, *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*, ch. xxiii.

CHAP. 56.—*The case of David, in illustration.*

Some such thought has occurred to us about the patriarch David, in the Book of Kings. After the prophet was sent to him, and was threatening him with the evils which were to arise from the anger of God on account of the sin which he had committed, he acknowledged his offence, and received pardon for it, for the prophet met his confession with the assurance that the crime and guilt had been remitted to him; but yet, for all that, the evils with which God had threatened him followed in due course, so that he was brought low by his son. Now why is not an objection at once raised here? If it was on account of his sin that God threatened him, why, when the sin was done away, did He fulfil His threat? Only, if the cavil had been raised, it would have been a most correct answer to say, that the remission of the sin was given that the man might not be hindered from gaining the life eternal; but the threatened evil was still carried into effect, in order that the man's piety might be exercised and approved in the lowly condition to which he was reduced. Thus it came to pass that God both inflicted on that man the death of his body, because of his sin, and, after his sins were forgiven, released him not [from his doom,] in order that he might be exercised in righteousness.

CHAP. 57. [XXXV.]

Let us hold fast, then, the confession of this faith, without faltering or failure. One alone is there who was born without sin, in the likeness of sinful flesh, who lived without sin amid the sins of others, and who died without sin on account of our sins. "Let us turn neither to the right hand nor to the left."¹ For to turn to the right hand is to deceive oneself, by saying that we are without sin; and to turn to the left is to surrender oneself to one's sins with a sort of impunity, in I know not how perverse and depraved a recklessness. "God indeed knoweth the ways on the right hand,"² even He who alone is without sin, and is able to blot out our sins; "but the ways on the left hand are perverse and crooked,"³ they are

¹ Prov. iv. 27.² Same verse [in the Septuagint; the clause occurs not in the Hebrew].³ [See the last note.]

in friendship with sins. Of such inflexibility were those youths of twenty years,¹ who foretokened in figure God's new people; they entered the land of promise; they, it is said, turned neither to the right hand nor to the left.² Now this age of twenty is not to be compared with the age of children's innocence. If I mistake not, this number is the shadow and echo of a mystery. For the Old Testament has its excellence in the five books of Moses, while the New Testament is most refulgent in the authority of the four Gospels. These numbers, when multiplied together, reach to the number twenty: four times five, or five times four, are twenty. Such a nation (as I have already said), instructed in the kingdom of heaven by the two Testaments—the Old and the New—turning neither to the right hand, in a proud assumption of righteousness, nor to the left hand, in a reckless delight in sin, shall enter into the land of promise, where we shall have no longer either to pray that sins may be forgiven to us, or to fear that they may be punished in us, having been freed from them all by that Redeemer, who, not being “sold under sin,”³ “hath redeemed Israel out of all his iniquities,”⁴ whether committed in the actual life, or derived from the original transgression.

CHAP. 53. [XXXVI.]

It is no small concession to the authority and truthfulness of the inspired pages which those persons have made, who, although unwilling to admit openly in their writings that remission of sins is necessary for infants, have yet confessed that they need redemption. Nothing that they have said [hereon] differs indeed from another word [known to us all,] even that which is derived from the very instruction of Christ. Whilst by those who faithfully read, faithfully hear, and faithfully hold fast the Holy Scriptures, it cannot be doubted that from that flesh, which first became sinful flesh by man's wilfulness, and which has been subsequently transmitted to all through successive generations, there has been propagated a sinful flesh [in every instance of birth,] with the single exception of that “likeness of sinful flesh,”⁵—which *likeness*, however, there could

¹ Num. xiv. 29, 31.

² Josh. xxiii. 6, 8.

³ Rom. vii. 14.

⁴ Ps. xxv. 22.

⁵ Rom. viii. 3.

not have been, had there not been also the *reality* of sinful flesh.

CHAP. 59.—*Whether the soul is propagated ; on obscure points, concerning which the Scriptures give us no assistance, we must be on our guard against forming hasty judgments and opinions ; the Scriptures are clear enough on those subjects which are necessary to salvation.*

Concerning *the soul*, indeed, the question arises, whether it is propagated by birth in the same way [as the flesh,] and bound by the same guilt and condemnation, which needs remission in its case (for we cannot say that it is only the flesh of the infant, and not his soul also, which requires the help of a Saviour and Redeemer ; or that the latter must not be included in that thanksgiving in the Psalms, where we read and repeat, “ Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits ; who forgiveth all thine iniquities ; who healeth all thy diseases ; who redeemeth thy life from destruction”¹) ; or if it be not likewise propagated, whether, by the very fact of its being mingled with and overloaded by the sinful flesh, it still has need of the remission of its own sin, and requires a redemption of its own, leaving it to God to determine, in the height of His foreknowledge,² what infants they are that deserve³ not to be absolved from that guilt and condemnation, even before they are born, and have yet in any instance ever done any actual good or evil. The question also arises, how God (even if He does not create souls by natural propagation) can yet not be the Author of that very sin and guilt, on account of which redemption by the sacrament is necessary to the infant’s soul. The subject is a wide and important one,⁴ and requires another treatise. The discussion, however, so far as I can judge, ought to be conducted with temper and moderation, so as to deserve the praise of cautious inquiry, rather than the censure of headstrong assertion. For whenever a question arises on an unusually obscure subject, on which no assistance can be rendered by clear and certain proofs of the Holy Scriptures, the presumption of man ought

¹ Ps. ciii. 2-4.

² We follow the reading, *per summam præscientiam*.

³ Non mereantur.

⁴ He treats it in his *Epistle*, 166 ; in his work, *De Animâ et ejus Origine* ; and in his *De Libero Arbitrio*, 42.

to restrain itself; nor should it attempt anything definite by leaning to either side. But if I must indeed be ignorant concerning any points of this sort, as to how they can be explained and proved, this much I should still believe, that from this very circumstance the Holy Scriptures would possess a most clear authority, whenever a point arose which no man could be ignorant of, without imperilling the salvation which has been promised him. You have now before you, [my dear Marcellinus,] this treatise, worked out to the best of my ability. I only wish that its value equalled its length; for its length I might probably be able to justify, only I should fear that, by adding the justification, I should stretch the prolixity beyond your endurance.

BOOK THIRD,

IN THE SHAPE OF A LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE SAME
MARCELLINUS.

IN WHICH AUGUSTINE REFUTES SOME ERRORS OF PELAGIUS ON THE QUESTION OF THE MERITS OF SINS AND THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS—BEING SUNDRY ARGUMENTS OF HIS WHICH HE HAD INTERSPERSED AMONG HIS EXPOSITIONS OF SAINT PAUL, IN OPPOSITION TO ORIGINAL SIN.

To his beloved son Marcellinus, Augustine, bishop and servant of Christ and of the servants of Christ, sendeth greeting in the Lord.

CHAP. I. [I.]—*Pelagius, a holy man, held in high esteem; his expositions on Saint Paul.*

THE questions which you proposed that I should write to you about, in opposition to those persons who say that Adam would have died even if he had not sinned, and that nothing of his sin has passed to his posterity by natural transmission; and especially on the subject of the baptism of infants, which the universal Church, with most pious and maternal care, maintains by constant celebration; and whether in this life there are, or have been, or ever will be, children of men without any sin at all—I have already fully discussed in the two preceding books, which, [as I have said,] have extended to a great length. And I venture to think that if in them I have not met all the points which perplex all men's minds on such matters (an achievement which, I apprehend,—nay, which I have no doubt,—lies beyond the power either of myself, or of any other person), I have at all events effected something in the shape of a firm ground on which those who defend the faith delivered to us against the novel opinions of its opponents may at any time take their stand, armed for the contest. However, within the last few days I have read some

writings by Pelagius,—a holy man, as I am told, who has made no small progress in the Christian life,—containing some brief expository notes on the epistles of the Apostle Paul; and therein I found, on coming to the passage where the apostle says, “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men,”¹ an argument which is used by those persons who say that infants are not burdened with original sin. Now I confess that I have not refuted this argument in my lengthy treatise, because it did not indeed once occur to me that anybody was capable of thinking or expressing such sentiments. Being, however, unwilling to increase the bulk of the work, which I had concluded, I have thought it right to insert in this epistle, [as an appendix to my treatise,] both the argument itself in the very words in which I read it, and the answer which it seems to me proper to give to it.

CHAP. 2. [II.]—*Pelagius' objection; infants reckoned among the number of faithful believers.*

In these terms, then, stands the argument in question:—“They who are opposed to the [opinion of the] propagation of sin endeavour to impugn it thus: If (say they) Adam’s sin was injurious even to those who do not sin, therefore Christ’s righteousness also profits those who do not believe; because [the apostle] says, ‘In like manner (nay, much more) are men saved by one, as they had previously perished by one.’” Now to this argument, I repeat, I advanced no reply in the two books which I previously addressed to you; nor, indeed, had I proposed to myself such a task. But in now [calling your attention to the new subject,] I beg you first of all to observe how, when they say, “If Adam’s sin is injurious even to those who do not sin, then Christ’s righteousness also profits those who do not believe,” they judge most absurdly and falsely, [in supposing, first,] that the righteousness of Christ profits those who do not believe, and thence thinking to put together such an argument as this: That even as the first man’s sin could possibly do no injury to infants who commit no sin, even so the righteousness of Christ is unable to benefit any who do not believe. Let them therefore tell us what is

¹ Rom. v. 12.

the use of Christ's righteousness to baptized infants ; let them by all means tell us what they mean. For of course, since they do not forget that they are Christians themselves, they have no doubt that there is some use and benefit. But whatever be this benefit, it is incapable (as they themselves assert) of benefiting those who do not believe. Whence they are obliged to class baptized infants in the number of believers, and to assent to the authority of the Holy Catholic Church, which does not account them unworthy of the name of believers to whom the righteousness of Christ could be, according to them, of no use except as believers. As, therefore, by the answer of their sponsors, through whose agency they are born again, the Spirit of holiness infuses into them that faith which, of their own will, they could not yet have attained, so the sinful flesh of those through whom they are born transfers to them that injury, which they have not yet contracted by any conduct of their own. And even as the Spirit of life regenerates them as believers in Christ, so also the body of death had generated them as sinners in Adam. The one makes them children of the flesh, the other children of the Spirit ; the one [makes them] children of death, the other children of the resurrection ; the one the children of the world, the other the children of God ; the one children of wrath, the other children of mercy ; and thus the one binds them under original sin, the other liberates them from the bond of every sin.

CHAP. 3.

We are driven at last to yield our assent on divine authority to that which we are unable to investigate with even the clearest intellect. It is well that they remind us themselves that Christ's righteousness is unable to profit any but believers, and that they yet allow that it yields some profit to infants ; for from this admission it follows (as we have already said) that they must, without any hesitation, find room for baptized infants among the number of believers. Consequently, if they are not baptized, they will have to rank amongst those who do not believe ; and therefore they will not even have life, but "the wrath of God abideth on them," inasmuch as "he that believeth not the Son shall not see life ; but the wrath of

God abideth on him ;”¹ and they are under judgment, since “he that believeth not is condemned already ;”² and they shall be condemned, since “he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”³ Our opponents must already see to it with what justice they can attempt or strive to maintain that human beings who are without sin have nothing to do with eternal life, but appertain to the wrath of God, and incur the divine judgment and condemnation, if [infants]—as they cannot have any actual sin, so also—have within them no original sin.

CHAP. 4.

To all the other points which Pelagius makes them urge who argue against original sin, I have, I think, sufficiently and clearly replied in the two former books of my lengthy treatise. Now if my reply should seem to any persons to be brief or obscure, I beg their pardon, and request the favour of their coming to equitable terms with those who perhaps censure my treatise, not for being too brief, but rather as being too long ; whilst any who still fail to understand the points which I cannot help thinking I have explained as clearly as the nature of the subject allowed me, shall certainly hear no blame or reproach from me for indifference, or want of understanding me.⁴ I would rather that they should pray God to give them intelligence.

CHAP. 5. [III.]—*Pelagius praised by some ; arguments against original sin proposed by Pelagius in his Commentary.*

But we must not indeed omit to observe that this good and praiseworthy man (as they who know him describe him to be) has not of himself advanced this argument against the natural transmission of sin, but has reproduced what is alleged by those persons who disapprove of the doctrine, and *that* not merely so far as I have just quoted and confuted the allegation, but also as to those other points on which I have now further undertaken to furnish a reply. Now, after saying, “If, according to them, Adam’s sin was injurious even to those who do not sin, therefore Christ’s righteousness also profits those

¹ John iii. 36.

² John iii. 18.

³ Mark xvi. 16.

⁴ [Or, “because they lack my own faculty of understanding the subject.”]

who do not believe,"—which sentence, you will perceive from what I have said in answer to it, is not only not repugnant to what we hold, but even reminds us what we ought to hold,—he at once goes on to add, "Then they contend, if baptism cleanses away that old sin, those children who are born of two baptized parents must needs be free from this sin, for they could not possibly have transmitted to those who came after them that which they did not possess themselves. Besides," says he, "if the soul is not born by natural propagation, but only the flesh, then only the latter has transmitted sin, and it alone deserves punishment; for they allege that it would be unfair for the soul, which is only now born, and comes not of the stock of Adam, to have to bear the burden of so old a sin, with which it has nothing to do. They say, likewise," says Pelagius, "that it cannot by any means be conceded that God, who remits to a man his own sins, should impute to him the sin of another."

CHAP. 6.

Pray, don't you see how Pelagius has inserted the whole of this paragraph in his writings, not in his own person, but in that of others, being so entirely sure of the novelty of this unheard-of doctrine, which is now beginning to raise its voice against the ancient opinion so natural to the Church, that he was actually ashamed or afraid to acknowledge it himself? And probably he does not really believe that a man is born without sin for whom he confesses that baptism to be necessary by which comes the remission of sins, or that the man is condemned without sin who must be reckoned, when unbaptized, in the class of non-believers, since the gospel of course cannot deceive us, when it most clearly asserts, "He that believeth not shall be damned;"¹ or, lastly, that the image of God, when without sin, is not admitted into the kingdom of God, forasmuch as "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;"² and so he must either be precipitated into eternal death without sin, or (what is still more absurd) must have eternal life outside the kingdom of God; for the Lord, when foretelling what He should say to His people at last,—“Come, ye blessed of

¹ Mark xvi. 16.² John iii. 5.

my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world,"¹—also clearly indicated what the kingdom was of which He was speaking; for He thus concludes: "So these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."² These opinions, then, and others which spring from the central error, I believe so worthy a man, and so good a Christian, does not at all accept, as being too perverse and repugnant to Christian truth. But it is quite possible that he may, by the very arguments of those who deny the transmission of sin by birth, be still so far distressed as to be anxious to hear or know what can be said in reply to them; and on this account he was both unwilling to keep silent the tenets propounded by them who deny the natural transmission of sin, in order that he might get the question in due time discussed, and, at the same time, declined to report the opinions in his own person, lest he should be supposed to entertain them himself.

CHAP. 7. [IV.]—*Proof of original sin in infants.*

Now, although I may not be able myself to refute the arguments of these men, I yet see how necessary it is to adhere closely to the clear and undoubted statements of the Scriptures, in order that the obscure passages may be explained by help of these, or, if the mind be as yet unequal to the function of either perceiving them when explained, or investigating them whilst abstruse, that they may be received and believed without misgiving. But what can be plainer than the many weighty testimonies of the inspired Scriptures, which afford to us the clearest proof possible that without union with Christ there is no man who can attain to eternal life and salvation; and that by the judgment of God no man can unjustly be damned,—that is, separated from that life and salvation? The inevitable conclusion from which truths is this, that (as nothing else is effected when infants are baptized than their incorporation into the church,—in other words, than their union with the body and members of Christ) unless this benefit [of the sacrament] be bestowed upon them, they are manifestly in danger of³ damnation. Damned, however, they

¹ Matt. xxv. 34.

² Matt. xxv. 46.

³ *Pertinere ad.*

could not be if they really had no sin. Now, since their tender age could not possibly have contracted sin by any act and conduct of their own, it remains for us, even if we are as yet unable to understand [the mystery,] at least to believe that infants inherit original sin.

CHAP. 8.—*Jesus is the Saviour even of infants.*

And therefore, if there is any ambiguity in the apostle's words when he says, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men;"¹ and if it is possible for them to be drawn aside, and applied to some other sense,—is there anything ambiguous in this statement: "Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God?"² Is this, again, ambiguous: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins?"³ Is there any doubt of what this means: "The whole need not a physician, but they that are sick?"⁴—in other words, Jesus is not needed by those who have no sin, but by those who are to be saved from sin. Is there anything, again, uncertain in this: "Except men eat the flesh of the Son of man," that is, become partakers of His body, "they shall not have life?"⁵ By these and similar statements, which I now pass over,—so absolutely clear in the light of God, so absolutely certain by His authority are they,—does not truth proclaim with unfaltering tongue, that unbaptized infants not only cannot enter into the kingdom of God, but cannot have everlasting life, except in the body of Christ, into which, that they may receive incorporation, they are washed in the sacrament of baptism? Does not truth, without any ambiguity, testify that for no other reason are they carried by pious hands to Jesus (that is, to Christ, the Saviour and Physician), than that they may be healed of the plague of their sin by the medicine of His sacraments? Why then do we delay so to understand the apostle's very words, of which we perhaps used to have some doubt, that they may agree with these statements of which we can have no manner of doubt?

¹ Rom. v. 12.

² John iii. 5.

³ Matt. i. 21.

⁴ Matt. ix. 12.

⁵ See John vi. 53.

CHAP. 9.

To me, however, no doubt presents itself about the whole of this passage, in which the apostle speaks of the condemnation of many through the sin of one, and the justification of many through the righteousness of One, except as to the words, "the figure of the Adam that was to come."¹ For this phrase in reality not only suits the sense which understands that Adam's posterity were to be born of the same form as himself along with sin, but the words are also capable of being drawn out into several distinct meanings. For we have ourselves actually contended for various senses from the words in question at different times,² and very likely we shall propound yet another view, which, however, will not be incompatible with the sense here mentioned; even Pelagius has not always expounded the passage in one way. All the rest, however, of the passage in which these doubtful words occur, if its statements are carefully examined and treated, as I have tried my best to do in the first book of this treatise, will not (in spite of the obscurity of style necessarily engendered by the subject itself) fail to show the incompatibility of any other meaning than that which has secured the adhesion of the Catholic Church from the earliest times—that believing infants have obtained through the baptism of Christ the remission of original sin.

CHAP. 10. [v.]—*He shows that former writers had never entertained a doubt about the original sin of infants.*

Accordingly, it is not without reason that the blessed Cyprian³ carefully shows how from the very first the Church holds this as a well understood article of faith, even when he was asserting the fitness of infants only just born to receive Christ's baptism, on a certain occasion when the question was submitted to him—whether this ought to be administered before the eighth day. He endeavoured, as far as he could, to prove these new-born babes perfect, that no one should be

¹ "Adam formam futuri;" see Rom. v. 14.

² Comp. above, Book i. c. 13; *Epist.* 157; *De Nuptiis*, ii. 44; and *Contra Julianum*, vi. 8.

³ See Cyprian's *Epistle*, 64 (*ad Fidum*); also Augustine, *Epist.* 166; *De Nuptiis*, ii. 49; *Contra Julianum*, ii. 5; *Ad Bonifacium*, iv. 3; *Sermons*, 294.

led to suppose, from the number of the days (on the ground that infants used formerly to be circumcised on the eighth day), that they so far lacked perfection. However, after bestowing upon them the full support of his argument, he still confessed that they were not free from original sin; if indeed he had denied this, he would have removed all reason for the very baptism which he was maintaining their fitness to receive. You can, if you wish, read for yourself the epistle of the illustrious martyr *On the Baptism of Little Children*; for it cannot fail to be within reach at Carthage. But be this as it may, I have deemed it right to transcribe some few statements of it into this letter of mine, so far as applies to the question before us; and I pray you to mark them carefully. "Now with respect," says he, "to the case of infants, whom you declared it would be improper to baptize if presented within the second and third day after their birth, [contending] that due regard ought to be paid to the old law of circumcision, as if you thought that the infant should not be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after its birth, [I can only say] that a far different view has been formed of the question in our council. Not a man there assented to what you thought ought to be done, but the whole of us rather determined that to no human being whatever, as soon as born, ought God's mercy and grace to be denied. For since the Lord in His gospel says, 'The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them,'¹ so far as in us lies, not a soul ought, if possible, to be lost." You observe how in these words [Cyprian] supposes that it is fraught with ruin and death, not only to the flesh, but also to the soul, for one to depart this life without the sacrament of salvation. Wherefore, if he said nothing else, it was at least competent to us to conclude from his words that without sin the soul could not perish. See, however, what (when he shortly afterwards maintains the innocence of infants) he at the same time allows concerning them in the plainest terms: "But if," says he, "anything could hinder men from the attainment of grace, then their heavier sins might well hinder those who have reached the stages of adults, and advanced life, and old age.

¹ Luke ix. 56.

Since, however, remission of sins is given even to the greatest sinners after they have believed, however much they have previously sinned against God, and since nobody is forbidden baptism and grace, how much more ought an infant not to be forbidden [these benefits,] who since his recent birth has done nothing amiss, except that from having been born after Adam in the flesh he has contracted from his very birth the contagion of the primeval death! How, too, does this fact contribute in itself the more easily to their reception of the forgiveness of sins, that the remission which they have is not of their own sins, but those of another!"

CHAP. 11.

You see with what confidence this great man expresses himself after the ancient and undoubted rule of faith. In advancing such very certain statements, his object was by help of these firm conclusions to prove the uncertain point which had been submitted to him by his correspondent, and concerning which he informs him that a decree of a council had been passed, to the effect that, if an infant were brought [to the font] even before the eighth day after his birth, no one should hesitate to baptize him. Now it was not then determined or affirmed by the council as a novel opinion, or struck out for the occasion by the opposition of any person, that infants were held bound by original sin; but [this doctrine was declared incidentally] when another controversy was being conducted, and the question was discussed, in reference to the law of the circumcision of the flesh, whether they ought to be baptized before the eighth day. None agreed with the person who held that they ought not to be so baptized, on the ground that it was not an open question admitting of discussion, whether the soul would forfeit eternal salvation if it ended this life without obtaining the sacrament of baptism, for this point was regarded as fixed and unassailable; but at the same time infants fresh from the womb were held to be affected only by the guilt of original sin. On this account, although remission of sins was easier in their case, because the sins were derived from another, it was nevertheless indispensable. It was on sure grounds like these that the

uncertain question *Of the Eighth Day* was solved, and the council decided that after a man was born, not a day ought to be lost in rendering him that succour which should prevent his perishing for ever. When also a reason was given for the circumcision of the flesh as being itself a shadow of the circumcision which was to be, its purport was not that we should understand that baptism ought to be administered to an infant on the eighth day after his birth, but rather that we are spiritually circumcised in the resurrection of Christ, who rose from the dead on the third day, indeed, after He suffered, but (reckoning by the days of the weekly cycles as their periods advanced) on the eighth,—in other words, on the first day after the Sabbath [or full week].

CHAP. 12. [VI.]—*The universal consensus respecting original sin.*

And now, again, with a novel boldness stimulated by an obscure controversy, certain persons are endeavouring to infuse uncertainty in our minds on a point which our forefathers used to bring forward as most certainly fixed, whenever they would solve such questions as seemed to some men to partake of uncertainty. When this controversy, indeed, first began, I am unable to say; but one thing I know, that even the holy Jerome, who is actually in our own day renowned for great industry and learning in ecclesiastical subjects, applies [our doctrine] as incontrovertibly furnishing most certain proof towards the solution of sundry questions treated in his writings. For instance, in his commentary on the prophet Jonah, when he comes to the passage where even infants are mentioned as afflicted with the fast, he says:¹ “The greatest age comes first, and then all the rest is pervaded down to the least.² For there is no man without sin, whether the span of his age be but that of a single day, or he reckon many years to his life. For if the very stars are unclean in the sight of God,³ how much more is a worm and corruption, such as are they who are held bound by the sin of the offending Adam?” If, indeed, we could readily interrogate this most learned man, how many authors who have treated of the divine Scriptures in both languages,⁴ and have written on

¹ St. Jerome, on Jonah iii.

² Ver. 3.

³ Job xxv. 4.

⁴ Or “who have treated of both languages of the divine Scriptures.”

Christian controversies, would he mention to us, who have never held any other opinion since the Church of Christ was founded, neither receiving any other from their forefathers, nor handing down any other to their posterity? My own reading, indeed, has been far more limited, but yet I do not recollect ever having heard of any other doctrine on this point from Christians, who accept the two Testaments, whether living in the Catholic Church, or even if found in any heretical or schismatic body. I do not remember, I say, that I have at any time found any other doctrine in such writers as have contributed anything to literature of this kind, whether they have followed the canonical Scriptures, or have supposed that they have followed them, or had wished to be so supposed. From what quarter this question has suddenly come upon us I know not. A short time ago,¹ in a random conversation with certain persons while we were at Carthage, my ears were suddenly offended with such a proposition as this: "That infants are not baptized for the purpose of receiving remission of sin, but that they may be sanctified in Christ." Although I was much disturbed by so novel an opinion, still, as there was no opportunity afforded me for gainsaying it, and as its propounders were not persons whose influence gave me anxiety, I readily let the subject slip into neglect and oblivion. But, strange to say,² it is now maintained with burning zeal against the Church; it is committed to our permanent notice by writing; nay, the matter is brought to such a pitch of distracting influence, that we are even consulted on it by our brethren [in Christ;] and we are actually³ obliged to oppose its progress both by disputation and by writing.

CHAP. 13. [VII.]—*The error of Jovinianus.*

A few years ago there lived at Rome one Jovinian, who is said to have persuaded nuns of even advanced age to marry,—not, indeed, by any prurient attraction, as if he wanted to make any of them his wife, but by contending that virgins

¹ We suppose in the year 411, when a conference was held at Carthage with the Donatists. Augustine says that he then saw Pelagius; see his work, *De Gestis Pelagii*, c. 46.

² Ecce.

³ Ecce.

who dedicated themselves to the ascetic life had no more merit before God than married women who believed. It never entered his mind, however, along with this conceit, to venture to affirm that the children of any persons are born without original sin. If, indeed, he had added such an opinion, the women might have more readily consented to marry, to give birth to the purest offspring. When this man's writings (for he had the courage to become a writer) were by the brethren forwarded to Jerome to refute, he not only discovered no such error in them, but, while looking out his conceits for refutation, he found among other passages this very clear testimony to the doctrine of man's original sin, from which Jerome indeed felt satisfied of the man's belief of that doctrine.¹ These are his words when treating of it: "He who says that he abides in Christ, ought himself also to walk even as He walked.² We give our opponent leave to choose which alternative he likes. Does he abide in Christ, or does he not? If he does, then, let him walk like Christ. If, however, it is a rash thing to undertake to resemble the excellences of Christ, he abides not in Christ, because he walks not as Christ did. He did no sin, neither was any deceit found in His mouth;³ who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; and as a lamb before its shearer is dumb, so He opened not His mouth;⁴ to whom the prince of this world came, and found nothing in Him;⁵ whom, though He had done no sin, God made sin for us.⁶ We, however, according to the Epistle of James, all commit many sins;⁷ none of us is pure from uncleanness, even if his life should be but of one day [upon the earth].⁸ For who shall boast that he has a clean heart? Or who shall be confident that he is pure from sins? We are held guilty according to the likeness of Adam's transgression. Accordingly David also says: 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.'⁹

¹ See Jerome's work *Against Jovinian*, ii. near the beginning.

² John ii. 6.

³ Isa. liii. 9.

⁴ Isa. liii. 7.

⁵ John xiv. 30.

⁶ 2 Cor. v. 21.

⁷ Jas. iii. 2.

⁸ Job xiv. 5 (Septuagint).

⁹ Ps. li. 5.

CHAP. 14.—*The opinions of all controversialists whatever are not, however, canonical authority; original sin, how another's; we were all one man in Adam.*

I have not quoted these words as if we might rely upon the opinions of every disputant as on canonical authority; but I have done it, that it may be seen how, from the beginning down to the present age, which has given birth to this novel opinion, the doctrine of original sin has been guarded with the utmost constancy as a part of the Church's faith, so that it is usually adduced as most certain ground whereon to refute other opinions when false, instead of being itself exposed to refutation by any one as false. Moreover, in the sacred books of the canon, the authority of this doctrine is vigorously asserted in the clearest and fullest way. The apostle exclaims: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."¹ Now from these words it cannot certainly be said, that Adam's sin has injured even those *who commit no sin*, for the Scripture says, "*In him all have sinned.*" Nor, indeed, are those sins of infancy so said to be *another's*, as if they did not appertain to the infants at all, inasmuch as all then sinned in Adam, when in his nature, by virtue of that innate power whereby he was able to produce them, they were still all the one Adam; but they are called the sin of *another*,² because as yet they were not living their own lives; but the life of the one man contained [in itself as a germ] whatsoever was [developed] in his future offspring.

CHAP. 15. [VIII.]

"It is," they say, "by no means conceded that the God who remits to a man his own sins should impute to him another's." He remits, indeed, but it is to the regenerate in spirit, not to those who are born of the flesh; but He imputes to a man no longer the sins of another, but only his own. They were no doubt the sins of another, whilst as yet they were not in existence who bore them when naturally produced; but now the sins belong to *them* by carnal generation, to whom they have not yet been remitted by spiritual regeneration.

¹ Rom. v. 12.

² *Aliena.*

CHAP. 16.—*Origin of errors ; a simile sought from the foreskin of the circumcised, and from the chaff of wheat.*

“But surely,” say they, “since baptism cleanses the primeval sin, they who are born of two baptized parents ought to be free from the said sin; for these could not have transmitted to their children that thing which they did not themselves possess.” Now observe whence error usually springs and spreads: it is when persons are sharp in starting subjects which they are not clever enough to understand. For before what audience, and in what words, can I explain how it is that birth in a sinful mortal condition brings no obstacle to those who have made a beginning in another, even immortal, condition of new birth, and at the same time proves an obstacle to those whom those very persons against whom it was not prejudicial have begotten of the self-same sinful condition? How can a man understand these things, whose dull labouring mind is impeded both by its own prejudiced opinions and by the chain of its own most stolid obstinacy? If indeed I had undertaken my cause in opposition to those who either altogether forbid the baptism of infants, or else contend that it is superfluous to baptize them, alleging that as they are born of believing parents, they must needs enjoy the merit of their parents, then it would have been my duty to have roused myself perhaps to greater labour and effort for the purpose of refuting their opinion. In that case, if I encountered a difficulty before obtuse and contentious men in refuting error and inculcating truth, owing to the obscurity which beset the nature of the subject, I should probably resort to such illustrations as were palpable and at hand; and I should in my turn ask them some questions,—how, for instance, if they were puzzled to know in what way sin, after being cleansed by baptism, still remained in those who were begotten of baptized parents, they would explain how it is that the foreskin, after being removed by circumcision, should still remain in the sons of the circumcised? or again, how it happens that the chaff which is winnowed off so carefully by human labour still keeps its place in the grain which springs from the winnowed wheat?

CHAP. 17. [IX.]

With these, and probably such as these, palpable arguments, should I endeavour, as I best could, to persuade those persons who believed that sacraments of cleansing were uselessly applied to the children of the cleansed, how proper is the purpose of baptizing the infants of baptized parents, and how it may happen that to a man who has within him the twofold seed—of death in the flesh, and of immortality in the spirit—that may prove no obstacle, regenerated as he is by the Spirit, which is prejudicial to his son, who is generated by the flesh; and that that may be cleansed in the one by remission, which in the other still requires cleansing by like remission, just as in the case supposed of circumcision, and as in the case of the winnowing and thrashing. But now, when we are contending with those who allow that the children of the baptized ought to be themselves baptized, how much more conveniently do we conduct our discussion, when we can say: You who assert that the children of such persons as have been cleansed from the pollution of sin ought to have been born without sin, why do you not perceive that by the same rule you might just as well say that the children of Christian parents ought to have been born Christians? Why, indeed, do you maintain that they ought to become Christians? Was there not in their parents a Christian body, to whom it is said, “Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ?”¹ Perhaps you suppose that a Christian body may be born of Christian parents, without having received a Christian soul? Well, this would render the case much more wonderful still. For you would think of the soul one of two things as you pleased,—because, of course, you hold with the apostle, that before birth it had done nothing good or evil,—that it was either derived by natural propagation [to the body,] and that just as the body of Christians is Christian, so should also their soul be Christian; or else that it was created by Christ, either in the Christian body, or for the use of the Christian body, and that it ought therefore to have been created or transmitted in a Christian condition. Unless perchance you shall pretend that, although Christian parents

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 15.

had it in their power to beget a Christian body, yet Christ Himself was not able to create a Christian soul. Yield then to the truth, and see that, as it has been possible (as you yourselves admit) for one who is not a Christian to be born of Christian parents, for one who is not a member of Christ to be born of members of Christ, and (that we may meet the views of all, who, however falsely, are yet in some sense possessed with a sense of religion) for a man who is not consecrated to be born of parents who are; so also it is quite possible for one who is not cleansed and sanctified to be born of parents who are in such a state. Now what answer will you give us, [explaining] why of Christian parents is born one who is not a Christian, unless it be that Christians are made not by natural birth, but by regeneration? Resolve therefore your own question with a like reason, that no one is cleansed from his sins by being born, but all are purified by the second birth. And thus of parents who are cleansed, because born again, any child who is born must himself be born again, in order that he too may be cleansed. For it was quite possible for parents to transmit to their children that which they possessed not themselves,—thus resembling not only the wheat which yielded the chaff, and the circumcised the foreskin, but also the instance which you yourselves adduce, even that of believers who transmit unbelief to their posterity. Now this circumstance does not accrue to the faithful as regenerated by the Spirit, but it is owing to the fact that they have been born of the flesh,—it is, in short, the fault of their mortal seed. For in respect of the infants whom you judge it necessary to make believers by the sacrament of the faithful, you do not deny that they were born in unbelief, although of believing parents.

CHAP. 18. [X.]—*Is the soul derived by natural propagation? Pelagius; sin is proved by punishment.*

Well, but “if the soul is not propagated, but only the flesh, then the latter alone is the propagator of sin, and it only deserves punishment.” This is what they think; and they say “that it is unjust that the soul which is only recently produced, and that not out of Adam’s substance, should bear the sin of another committed so long ago.” Now observe,

I pray you, how the cautious Pelagius felt the question about the soul to be a very difficult one, and acted accordingly (for the words which I have just quoted are copied from a book of his). He does not say absolutely, "Because the soul is not propagated," but hypothetically, *If the soul is not propagated*, rightly determining on so obscure a subject (on which we can find in Holy Scriptures no certain and obvious testimonies, or with very great difficulty discover any) to speak with hesitation rather than with confidence. Wherefore I too, on my side, answer with no hasty assertion this proposition: "If the soul is not propagated, where is the justice in that, which has been but recently created and is quite free from the contagion of sin, being compelled in infants to endure the passions and other torments of the flesh, and, what is more terrible still, even the attacks of evil spirits? For never does the flesh experience any sufferings of this kind without the indwelling and sympathizing soul also incurring the misery to even a greater degree." If this, indeed, is shown to be just, it may be shown, on the same terms, with what justice original sin comes to exist in our sinful flesh, to be subsequently cleansed by the sacrament of baptism and God's gracious mercy. If the former point cannot be shown, I imagine that the latter point is equally incapable of demonstration. We must therefore either bear with both positions in silence, and remember that we are human, or else we must prepare, at some other time, another work "*On the Soul*," if it shall appear necessary, discussing the whole question with caution and sobriety.

CHAP. 19. [XI.]

We must, however, for the present accept what the apostle says: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned;"¹ and in such a way, indeed, that we seem not rashly and foolishly to oppose the many great passages of Holy Scripture, which teach us that no man can obtain eternal life without that union with Christ which is effected in Him and with Him, when we are imbued with His sacraments and incorporated with the members of His body. Now this state-

¹ Rom. v. 12.

ment which the apostle addresses to the Romans, "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned," tallies in sense with his words to the Corinthians: "Since by man came death, by Man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."¹ For nobody doubts that the subject here referred to is the death of the body, because the apostle was with much earnestness dwelling on the resurrection of the body. If he says nothing in this latter passage about sin, it evidently is because the question was not about righteousness. Both points are mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, and both points are, at very great length, insisted on by the apostle,—sin in Adam, righteousness in Christ; also death in Adam, life in Christ. However, as I have observed already, I have thoroughly examined and opened, in the first book of this treatise, all these words of the apostle's argument, as far as I was able, and as much as seemed necessary.

CHAP. 20.—*The sting of death, what?*

But even in the passage to the Corinthians, where he had been treating fully of the resurrection, the apostle concludes his statement in such a way as not to permit us to doubt that the death of the body is the result of sin. For after he had said, "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality: so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then," he added, "shall be brought to pass the saying which is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" and at last he subjoined these words: "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law."² Now, because (as the apostle's words most plainly declare) death shall then be swallowed up in victory when this corruptible and mortal body shall have put on incorruption and immortality,—that is, when "Christ shall quicken our mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in us,"—it manifestly follows that the sting of the body of this death, which is the contrary of the resurrection of the body, is sin. It is the sting, however, by which death

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

² 1 Cor. xv. 53-56.

was made, and not which made death, since it is by sin that we die, and not by death that we sin. It is therefore called "the sting of death" on the principle which originated the phrase "the tree of life,"—not because the life of man produced it, but because by it the life of man was made. In like manner "the tree of knowledge" was that whereby man's knowledge was made, not that which man made by his knowledge. So also "the sting of death" is that by which death was produced, not that which death made. We similarly use the expression "the cup of death," [or "deadly cup,"] when one dies of it, or might die of it,—not meaning, of course, a cup made by a dying or dead man. The sting of death is therefore sin, because by its puncture the human race has been affected with death. Why further ask, of whose death,—the death of the soul, or the death of the body? Is it the first death which we are all of us now dying, or that second death which the wicked shall then endure? There is no occasion for plying the question so curiously; there is no room for subterfuge. The words in which the apostle expresses the case are used by him to answer his own questions: "When this mortal," says he, "shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying which is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." [Then come his questions:] "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" [And here is the answer:] "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." He was treating of the resurrection of the body, wherein death shall be swallowed up in victory, when this mortal shall have put on immortality. Then over death itself shall be raised the shout of triumph, when at the resurrection of the body it shall be swallowed up in victory; then shall be said to it, "O grave, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?" To the death of the body shall this challenge be addressed. For it is immortality which shall absorb the victory, when this mortal body shall clothe itself in immortality. I repeat it, to the death of the body shall it be said, "Where is thy victory?"—that victory in which thou didst conquer all, so that even the Son of God engaged with thee in conflict; and by not shrinking but grappling with thee He overcame. Over the dying thou hast triumphed; but thou art thyself conquered in

the children of the resurrection. Thy victory was but temporary, in which thou didst absorb the bodies of them that die. Our victory will last for evermore, in which thou art absorbed in the bodies of them that rise again. "Where is thy sting?"—that is, the sin wherewithal we are punctured and poisoned, so that thou didst fix thyself in our very bodies, and for so long a time didst hold them in possession. "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." We all sinned in one, so that we all die in one; we received the law, not by amendment according to its precepts to put an end to sin, but by transgression to increase it. For "the law entered that sin might abound;"¹ and "the Scripture hath concluded all under sin;"² but "thanks be to God, who hath given us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ,"³ in order that "where sin abounded, grace might much more abound;"⁴ and "that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe;"⁵ and that we might overcome death by a deathless resurrection, and sin, "the sting" thereof, by a free and gracious justification.

CHAP. 21. [XII.]—*The precept about touching the menstruous woman not to be figuratively understood; the necessity of the sacraments.*

Let no one, then, on this subject be either deceived or a deceiver. The manifest bearing of Holy Scripture which we have considered, removes all subterfuge. Even as death is in this our mortal body derived from the beginning, so from the first has sin been drawn into this sinful flesh of ours, for the cure of which, both as it is derived by natural descent and augmented by wilful transgression, as well as for the quickening of our flesh itself, our Physician came in the likeness of sinful flesh, who is not needed by the sound, but only by the sick,—who came not to call the righteous, but only sinners.⁶ Therefore the saying of the apostle, when advising believers not to separate themselves from unbelieving partners: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy,"⁷ must be either so

¹ Rom. v. 20.

² Gal. iii. 22.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 57.

⁴ Rom. v. 20.

⁵ Gal. iii. 22.

⁶ Mark ii. 17.

⁷ 1 Cor. vii. 14.

understood as both we ourselves elsewhere,¹ and as Pelagius in his notes on this same Epistle to the Corinthians,² has expounded it, according to the purport of the examples mentioned in the preceding verses, that sometimes wives gained husbands to Christ, and sometimes husbands converted wives, whilst the Christian will of even one of the parents prevailed towards making their children Christians; or else, if (as the apostle's words seem rather to indicate, and to a certain degree persuade us) some particular sanctification is to be here understood, which used to sanctify an unbelieving husband or wife by the believing partner, and through which the children of the believing parents were sanctified,—whether it was that the husband or the wife, during the woman's menstruation, abstained from cohabiting together, having learned that duty in the law (for Ezekiel classes this amongst the precepts which were not to be taken in a metaphorical sense³), or on account of some other voluntary sanctification which is not there expressly prescribed,—a sprinkling of holiness arising out of the close ties of married life and children;—yet whatever be the sanctification meant, this point must be steadily kept in view, that there is no other valid means of making Christians and remitting sins, if men do not become believers through the sacraments according to the institution of Christ and the Church. For neither are unbelieving husbands and wives, notwithstanding their intimate union with holy and righteous spouses, cleansed of the sin which separates men from the kingdom of God and drives them into condemnation, nor are the children who are born of parents, however just and holy, absolved from the guilt of original sin, unless they have been baptized into Christ, in behalf of whom our plea should be the more earnest, the less able they are to urge one themselves.

CHAP. 22. [XIII.]—*We ought to be anxious to secure the baptism of infants.*

For this is the point aimed at by the controversy, against

¹ See Augustine's work *On the Sermon on the Mount*, i. 16.

² See the *Commentaries on St. Paul* in Jerome's works, vol. viii., the work of either Pelagius or one of his followers.

³ Ezek. xviii. 6.

the novelty of which we have to struggle by the aid of ancient truth, that it is clearly altogether superfluous for infants to be baptized. Not that this opinion is avowed in so many words, lest so firmly established a custom of the Church should prove too much for its assailants. If we are taught to render help to orphans, how much more ought we to labour in behalf of those children who, though under the protection of parents, will still be left more destitute and wretched than orphans, should that grace of Christ be denied them, which they are all unable to demand for themselves?

CHAP. 23.

As for what they say, that some men, by the use of their reason, have lived, and do live, in this world without sin, it is to be wished it were true. We should strive to make it true, and pray that it become a fact; but, at the same time, we must confess that the fact has not yet been realized. For to those who wish and strive and worthily pray for this result, whatever sins remain in them are daily remitted by means of their application which we sincerely offer up, "Forgive us as we forgive our debtors."¹ Whosoever shall deny that this prayer is in this life necessary for every righteous man who knows and does the will of God, except the one Holy [King] of saints, greatly errs, and is utterly incapable of pleasing even Him whom he praises. Moreover, if he supposes himself to be such a character, "he deceives himself, and the truth is not in him,"²—for no other reason than that his thoughts are false. That Physician, then, who is not needed by the sound, but by the sick, knows how to heal us, and by healing to perfect us unto eternal life; nor does He in this world actually take away death, although inflicted because of sin, from those whose sins He remits, that they may enter on their conflict, having to overcome the fear of death with full sincerity of faith. In some cases, too, He declines to help even His righteous servants, so long as they are capable of still higher elevation, to the attainment of a perfect righteousness, in order that (while in His sight no man living is justified³) we may always feel it to be our

¹ Matt. vi. 12.² 1 John i. 8.³ Ps. cxliii. 2.

duty to give Him thanks for mercifully bearing with us, and so, by holy humility, be healed of that first cause of all our failings, even the swellings of pride. This letter, as my intention first sketched it, was to have been a short one; it has grown into a lengthy book. Would that it were as perfect as it has at last become complete!

...
dily
king
70

EXTRACT FROM
AUGUSTINE'S "RETRACTATIONS,"

BOOK II. CHAP. 37,

ON THE FOLLOWING TREATISE,

"DE SPIRITU ET LITTERA."



THE person¹ to whom I had addressed the three books entitled *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, in which I carefully discussed also the baptism of infants, informed me, when acknowledging my communication, that he was much disturbed because I declared it to be possible that a man might be without sin, if he wanted not the will, by the help of God, even though in this life no man either had lived, was living, or would live, so perfect in righteousness. He asked how I could say *that* was possible of which no example could be adduced. Owing to such an inquiry on the part of this person, I wrote the treatise entitled *De Spiritu et Littera*. In handling this subject, I largely considered the apostle's

¹ [The Tribune Marcellinus, with whose name are connected many other treatises of Augustine. In this work the author informs us that the occasion of its composition was furnished by this person, who mooted an inquiry touching a statement in the preceding books *Concerning the Merits and the Remission of Sins*. Those books, as we have already indicated, were published A.D. 412. Now in the *Retractations* there is placed after these very books the present work *Concerning the Spirit and the Letter*,—not, indeed, immediately next, but in the fourth place after,—so that it was written, no doubt, about the end of the same year, A.D. 412, some time previous to the death of Marcellinus; who was killed in the month of September of the following year, 413. This present work is also mentioned in the book *On Faith and Works*, c. 14; and in that *On Christian Doctrine*, iii. 33.]—ED. BENED.

statement, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."¹ In this work, so far as God enabled me, I earnestly discussed the point with those who oppose that grace of God which justifies the ungodly. While treating, however, of the observances of the Jews, who abstain from sundry meats and drinks in accordance with their ancient law, I mentioned "the ceremonies of certain meats" [Quarumdam escarum cerimonix]²—a phrase which, though not used in Holy Scripture, seemed to me very convenient, because I remembered that *cerimonix* is tantamount to *carimonix* [as if from *carere*, to be without], and expresses the abstinence of the worshippers from certain things. If, however, there is any other derivation of the word, which is inconsistent with the true religion, I meant no reference whatever to it; I confined my use to the sense above indicated. This work of mine begins thus: "After perusing the short treatises which I lately drew up for you, my beloved son Marcellinus," etc.

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 6.

² See chap. 36. [xxi.]

A TREATISE ON THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER,

IN ONE BOOK,

ADDRESSED TO MARCELLINUS, A.D. 412.

MARCELLINUS, IN A LETTER TO AUGUSTINE, HAD EXPRESSED SOME SURPRISE AT HAVING READ, IN THE PRECEDING WORK, OF THE POSSIBILITY BEING ALLOWED OF A MAN CONTINUING, IF HE WILLED IT, WITHOUT SIN IN THE PRESENT LIFE, ALTHOUGH THERE EXISTS NOT A SINGLE HUMAN EXAMPLE ANYWHERE OF SUCH PERFECT RIGHTEOUSNESS. AUGUSTINE TAKES THE OPPORTUNITY OF DISCUSSING, IN OPPOSITION TO THE PELAGIANS, THE SUBJECT OF GOD'S ASSISTING GRACE; AND HE SHOWS THAT THE DIVINE HELP TO THE WORKING OF RIGHTEOUSNESS BY US DOES NOT LIE IN THE FACT OF GOD'S HAVING GIVEN US A LAW WHICH IS FULL OF GOOD AND HOLY PRECEPTS; BUT IN THE FACT THAT OUR VERY WILL, WITHOUT WHICH WE CAN DO NOTHING GOOD, IS ASSISTED AND ELEVATED BY THE SPIRIT OF GRACE BEING IMPARTED TO US, WITHOUT THE AID OF WHICH THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAW IS "THE LETTER THAT KILLETH," BECAUSE INSTEAD OF JUSTIFYING THE UNGODLY, IT RATHER CORROBORATES THEIR GUILT. HE BEGINS TO TREAT OF THE QUESTION PROPOSED TO HIM AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THIS WORK, AND RETURNS TO IT TOWARDS ITS CONCLUSION; HE SHOWS THAT, AS ALL ALLOW, MANY THINGS ARE POSSIBLE WITH GOD'S HELP, OF WHICH THERE OCCURS INDEED NO EXAMPLE; AND THEN CONCLUDES THAT, ALTHOUGH A PERFECT RIGHTEOUSNESS IS UNEXAMPLED AMONG MEN, IT IS FOR ALL THAT NOT IMPOSSIBLE.

CHAP. 1. [I.]—*The occasion of this work being written; a thing may be capable of being realized, and yet may never reach reality.*

AFTER perusing the short treatises which I lately drew up for you, my beloved son Marcellinus, touching the baptism of infants, and the perfection of man's righteousness,—how that no one in this life seems either to have attained or to be likely to attain to it, except only the Mediator, who experienced our human condition in the likeness of sinful flesh, without any sin whatever,—you wrote me in answer that you were embarrassed by the point which I advanced in the first book, that it was possible for a man to be without sin, if he

wanted not the will, and was assisted by the grace of God ; and yet that no one, except Him in whom "all shall be made alive,"¹ has ever lived or will live by whom this perfection has been attained whilst living here. It appeared to you absurd to say that anything was possible of which no example ever occurred,—although I suppose you would not hesitate to admit that no camel ever passed through a needle's eye,² and yet He said that even this was possible with God ; you may read, too, that twelve legions³ of angels could have fought for Christ and rescued Him from suffering, but in fact did not ; you will find, also, how possible it was for the [Canaanite] nations to be exterminated at once out of the land which was given to the children of Israel,⁴ and yet that God willed it to be gradually effected.⁵ And one may meet with a thousand other incidents, the past or the future possibility of which we might readily admit, and yet be unable to produce any proofs of their having ever really happened. Accordingly, it would not be right for us to deny the possibility of a man's living without sin, on the ground that amongst men none can be found except Him who is in His nature not man only, but also God, in whom we could prove such perfection of character to have existed.

CHAP. 2. [II.]

Here, perhaps, you will say to me in answer, that the works which I have instanced as not having been realized, although capable of realization, are *divine* works ; whereas a man's being without sin actually falls in the range of a man's own work,—that being indeed his very noblest work which effects a full and perfect righteousness complete in every part ; and therefore that it is incredible that no man has ever existed, or is existing, or will exist in this life, who has achieved such a work, if the achievement is possible for a human being. But then you ought to reflect that, although this great work, no doubt, belongs to human agency to accomplish, yet it is the

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 22.

² Matt. xix. 24.

³ Augustine's text has "twelve *thousand* legions," both here and below in chap. lxii. See Matt. xxvi. 53.

⁴ Deut. xxxi. 3.

⁵ Judg. ii. 3.

result of the divine help, and that it is undoubtedly, therefore, a divine work; "for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure."¹

CHAP. 3.—*Theirs is comparatively a harmless error, who say that a man lives here without sin.*

They therefore are not a very dangerous set of persons (and we must urge them to show, if possible, that such is their character), who hold that man lives or has lived here without any sin whatever. There are indeed passages of Scripture, in which I apprehend it is definitely stated that no man who lives on earth, although enjoying freedom of will, can be found without sin; as, for instance, the place where it is written, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, [O Lord,] for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified."² If, however, anybody shall have succeeded in persuading people that this text and similar ones ought to be taken in a different sense from their obvious one, and shall have shown that some man or men have spent a sinless life on earth, whoever not merely refrains from opposing him slightly, but also agrees with him to the full, is not affected by the ordinary stimulus of envy. Moreover, if there neither is, has been, nor will be any man endowed with such perfection of holiness (which I am more inclined to believe), who yet is firmly set forth and thought to be, to have been, or to be about to be in possession of such an excellence, so far as I can judge, no great error is made, and certainly not a dangerous one, when a man indulges such an opinion, carried away by a certain benevolent feeling; but whoever thinks so much of another, should not deem himself to be so pure a being, unless he has really and clearly discovered all this of himself.

CHAP. 4.—*Theirs is a much more serious error, and requiring a very vigorous refutation, who deny God's grace to be necessary for us; grace, according to the Pelagians, is nothing but God's gift to man of free-will, and the teaching of the law.*

They, however, must be resisted with the utmost alacrity and vigour who suppose that the mere power of the human will in itself, without God's help, can either perfect righteousness or advance towards it in an even tenor; and when they

¹ Phil. ii. 13.

² Ps. cxliii. 2.

begin to be hard pressed about their presumption in asserting that this result can be reached without the divine assistance, they check themselves, and do not venture to utter such an opinion, because they see how impious and insufferable it is. But they allege that such attainments are not possible without God's help, seeing that God created man with the free choice of his will, and, by giving him His commandments, teaches man, Himself, how he ought to live; and indeed assists him, in that He takes away his ignorance by instructing him in the knowledge of what he ought to avoid and to desire in his actions; and thus, by means of the free-will naturally implanted within him, he enters on the way which is pointed out to him, perseveres in a just and pious course of life, and arrives (as he deserves) at the blessedness of eternal life.

CHAP. 5. [III].—*True grace is the gift of the Holy Ghost, which kindles in the soul the joy and love of what is good.*

We, however, on our side affirm that the human will is so divinely aided in the pursuit of righteousness, that (in addition to the fact of man's being created with a free-will, and besides the doctrine which instructs him how he ought to live) he receives the Holy Ghost, by whose gift there springs up in his mind a delight in, and a love of, that supreme and unchangeable good which is God, even in the present state, while he still "walks by faith" and not yet "by sight;"¹ in order that by this gift to him of the earnest, as it were, of the free gift, he may conceive an ardent desire to cleave to his Maker, and burn to approach to a participation in that true light, that it may go well with him from Him to whom he owes all that he is. A man's free-will, indeed, only avails to induce him to sin, if he knows not the way of truth; and even after his duty and his proper aim shall begin to become known to him, unless he take delight and feel a love therein, he neither does his duty, nor sets about it, nor effects a righteous life. Now, in order that such a course may engage our affections, God's "love is shed abroad in our hearts," not through the free-will which arises from ourselves, but "through the Holy Ghost, which is given to us."²

¹ 2 Cor. v. 7.

² Rom. v. 5.

CHAP. 6. [IV.]—*The teaching of the law without the life-giving spirit is “the letter that killeth.”*

For that doctrine which furnishes us with the command to live in chastity and holiness is “the letter that killeth,” unless accompanied with “the spirit that giveth life.” Now that is not the sole meaning of the passage, “The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,”¹ which merely prescribes our not taking in the literal sense any figurative phrase which in the proper meaning of its words would only produce nonsense; but it also signifies that we should regard the underlying sense of the figurative terms, cherishing the inner man by our spiritual intelligence, because “being carnally-minded is death, whilst to be spiritually-minded is life and peace.”² If, for instance, a man were to take in a literal and carnal sense the contents of the Song of Solomon, he would minister not to the fruit of a pure and luminous charity, but to the feeling of a libidinous desire. Therefore I repeat, the apostle’s principle is not to be confined to the limited application just mentioned, when he says, “The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life;”³ but it must also (and indeed mostly) be regarded as equivalent to what he says elsewhere in the plainest words: “I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet;”⁴ and again, immediately after: “Sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.”⁵ Now from this you may see what is meant by “the letter that killeth.” There is indeed no figurative intention in a phrase which could not be so regarded in its plain sense, as when it is said, “Thou shalt not covet.” This is a very plain and salutary precept; and any man who shall fulfil it will have no sin at all. The apostle, indeed, purposely selected this general precept, in which he embraced everything, as if this were the voice of the law which prohibits us from all sin, when it says, “Thou shalt not covet;” for there is no sin committed except by evil concupiscence; so that the law which prohibits this is a good and praiseworthy law. Still, when the Holy Ghost withholds His help, which inspires us with a good desire instead of this evil concupiscence (in other words, diffuses charity in our

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 6.

² Rom. viii. 6.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 6.

⁴ Rom. vii. 7.

⁵ Rom. vii. 11.

hearts), that law, however good in itself, only augments the evil desire by forbidding it. Just like the rush of water which flows incessantly in a particular direction; it becomes more violent when it meets with any impediment, and when it has overcome the stoppage, it falls in a greater bulk, and with increased impetuosity hurries forward in its downward course. I know not indeed how it is, but the very object which we covet becomes all the more pleasant and desired by being forbidden. Now this is the sin which through the commandment deceives and slays, whenever transgression is actually added, which occurs not where there is no law.¹

CHAP. 7. [v.]—*What is proposed to be here treated; righteousness the work of God, but not unaccompanied with the will of man.*

We will, however, consider, if you please, the whole of this passage of the apostle and thoroughly handle it, as the Lord shall enable us. For I want, if I shall be able, to prove that the apostle's words, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life," have no reference to figurative phrases,—although even in this sense a suitable signification might be obtained from them,—but rather plainly to the law, which forbids whatever is evil. When I shall have proved this, it will more manifestly appear that to lead a holy life is the gift of God,—not only because God has given a free-will to man, without which there is no living ill or well; and not only because He has given him a commandment to teach him how he ought to live; but because through the Holy Ghost He sheds love abroad in the hearts² of those whom He foreknew, in order to predestinate them; whom He predestinated, that He might call them; whom He called, to justify them; and whom He justified, that He might glorify them.³ When this point also shall be cleared, you will, I think, see how vain it is to call those things barely possible which are unexampled, when they are the works of God,—such as the passage of the camel through the needle's eye, which we have already referred to, and other similar cases, which to us no doubt are impossible, but easy enough to God; [and equally vain] to reckon man's righteousness in this class of things, on the ground of its being properly

¹ Rom. iv. 15.

² Rom. vii. 7.

³ Rom. viii. 29, 30.

man's work, not God's; [and no less vain] to hold that, if a perfect righteousness in the present life is possible, there is no reason for supposing that there can be no example forthcoming. That the assertion of such propositions is undoubtedly vain will be clear enough, after it has been also plainly shown that even man's righteousness must be attributed to the operation of God, although not taking place without the co-operation of man's will. We therefore cannot refuse to admit that his righteousness may be perfect even in this life, because all things are possible with God,¹—both those which He accomplishes of His own sole will, and those which He appoints to be done with the co-operation with Himself of His creature's will. Accordingly, whatever of such things He does not effect is no doubt without an example in the way of an accomplished fact, although before God and in His power it possesses the cause of its possible accomplishment, and in His wisdom the reason of its not coming to pass; and should this cause escape the penetration of the human mind, let not the thinker forget that he is but human; nor charge God with folly simply because he cannot fully comprehend His wisdom.

CHAP. 8. Attend, then, carefully, while in his Epistle to the Romans the apostle explains and clearly enough shows that the passage which he wrote to the Corinthians, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,"² must be understood in the sense which we have already indicated,—that the letter of the law, which teaches us not to commit sin, kills, if the life-giving spirit be absent, forasmuch as it causes sin to be known rather than avoided, to be increased rather than diminished, because to an evil concupiscence there is now added the transgression of the law.

CHAP. 9. [VI.]—*Through the law sin has abounded; divine grace; the law.*

The apostle, then, wishing to commend the grace which has come to all nations through Jesus Christ, and to prevent the Jews from extolling themselves at the expense of other people on account of their having received the law, first says that sin and death came on the human race through one man, and that righteousness and eternal life came also through One, expressly

¹ Mark x. 27.

² 2 Cor. iii. 6.

mentioning Adam as the former, and Christ as the latter; and he then goes on to declare that "the law entered, that the offence might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord;"¹ then, proposing a question for himself to answer, he adds, "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid."² He saw, indeed, that a perverse use might be made by perverse men of what he had said: "The law entered, that the offence might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound,"—he might, in short, be made to say that sin had profited by the abundance of grace. Rejecting so worthless an insinuation, he answers his question with a "God forbid!" and at once subjoins another question: "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?"³ as much as to say, When grace has brought it to pass that we should die unto sin, what else shall we be doing, if we continue to live in it, than showing ourselves ungrateful to grace? The man who extols the virtue of a medicine does not contend for any advantage of diseases and wounds of which the medicine cures him; on the contrary, in proportion to the praise lavished on the remedy are the blame and horror which are felt of the diseases and wounds healed by the much-extolled medicine. In like manner, the commendation and praise which are bestowed upon grace imply an equal amount of hatred and condemnation of all sins. The corrupt state of his weakness had to be set forth with convincing clearness to man, who derived no advantage and help against his sinful nature in that good and holy law, which rather increased than diminished his iniquity; for the law indeed entered, that the offence might abound. The purpose of this dispensation was that man, being convicted and confounded, might see not only that he wanted a doctor, but also that he had a helper in God, who would so direct his steps that sin should not lord it over him, and that he might be healed by betaking himself to the help of the divine mercy; and that in this way, where sin abounded grace might

¹ Rom. v. 20, 21.² Rom. vi. 1, 2.³ Rom. vi. 2.

much more abound,—not (to be sure) through the merit of the sinner, but by the intervention of his Helper.

CHAP. 10.

Accordingly, the apostle describes the same medicine as mystically set forth in the passion and resurrection of Christ, when he says, “Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is justified from sin. Now, if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with Him: knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.”¹ Now it is plain enough that here by the mystery of the Lord’s death and resurrection is figured the fall of our old sinful life, and the rise of the new; and that here is demonstrated the abolition of iniquity and the renewal of righteousness. Whence then arises this vast benefit to man through the letter of the law, except it be through the faith of Jesus Christ?

CHAP. 11. [VII.]—*From what fountain good works emanate; pride.*

This holy meditation preserves “the children of men, who put their trust under the shadow of God’s wings,”² so that they are “enriched with the fatness of His house, and drink of the full stream of His pleasure. For in Him [they find] the fountain of life, and in His light shall they see light. For He extendeth His mercy to them that know Him, and His righteousness to the upright in heart.”³ He does not, indeed, extend

¹ Rom. vi. 3-11.² Ps. xxxvi. 7.³ Ps. xxxvi. 8-10.

His mercy to them because they know Him, but that they may know Him ; nor is it because they are upright in heart, but that they may become so, that He extends to them His righteousness, whereby He justifies the ungodly.¹ This meditation elevates no man with pride : this sin arises when any man has too much confidence in himself, and makes himself the chief aim of his life. Impelled by this vain feeling, he departs from that fountain of life, from the draughts of which is imbibed the holiness which is itself the good man's life,—[departs,] too, from that unchanging light, by partaking of which man's reasonable soul is in a certain sense set on fire, and becomes itself a created and reflected luminary ; even as "John was a burning and a shining light,"² who notwithstanding acknowledged the source of his own illumination in the words, "Of His fulness have all we received."³ Of whose, I would ask, but His, of course, in comparison with whom John indeed was no light at all ? For "that was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."⁴ Therefore, in the previously quoted psalm, after saying, "Extend Thy mercy to them that know Thee, and Thy righteousness to the upright in heart,"⁵ he adds, "Let not the foot of pride come against me, and let not the hands of sinners move me. There have fallen all the workers of iniquity : they are cast out, and are not able to stand."⁶ For by that impiety which leads each to attribute to himself the excellence which is God's, he is cast out into his own native darkness, in which consist the works of iniquity ; it is manifestly these works which he does spontaneously, and for the achievement of such alone is he naturally fit. The works of righteousness he never does, except as he receives ability from that fountain and that light, which comprises the life that wants for nothing, and where is "no variableness, nor the shadow of turning."⁷

CHAP. 12.—*Paul, whence so called ; bravely contends for grace.*

Accordingly Paul, who, instead of his former name Saul,⁸ chose this new designation, for no other reason, as it appears

¹ Rom. iv. 5.

² John v. 35.

³ John i. 16.

⁴ John i. 9.

⁵ Ps. xxxvi. 10.

⁶ Ps. xxxvi. 11, 12.

⁷ Jas. i. 17.

⁸ Acts xiii. 9.

to me, than because he would show himself *little*,¹—the very “least of the apostles,”²—contends with much courage and earnestness against the proud and arrogant, and such as plume themselves on their own works, in order that he may commend the mighty grace of God. This grace, indeed, appeared more obvious and manifest in his case, inasmuch as, while he was pursuing such vehement measures of persecution against the Church of God as made him worthy of the greatest punishment, he found mercy instead of condemnation, and instead of punishment obtained grace. Very properly, therefore, does he lift voice and hand in defence of grace. He cares not for the envy either of those who understood not a subject too profound and abstruse for their intelligence, or of those who perversely misinterpreted his own sound words; whilst at the same time he unfalteringly preaches that gift of God, whereby alone salvation accrues to those who are the children of the promise, children of the divine goodness, children of grace and mercy, children of the new covenant. In the salutation with which he begins every epistle, he is full of it: “Grace be to you, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ;”³ whilst in his Epistle to the Romans it forms almost the only topic, and is plied with so much persistence and variety of argument, as fairly to fatigue the reader’s attention,—only the fatigue is so useful and salutary, that it rather exercises than breaks the faculties of the inner man.

CHAP. 13. [VIII.]—*Keeping the law; the Jews’ glorying, what; the fear of punishment; the circumcision of the heart.*

Then comes what I mentioned above; he proceeds to show up the Jew; he tells him how he calls himself a Jew, but by no means fulfils what he promises to do. “Now,” says he, “thou callest thyself a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest His will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou art thyself a guide of the blind, a light of them that are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law. Thou therefore who teachest another,

¹ See Augustine’s *Confessions*, viii. 4.

² 1 Cor. xv. 9.

³ See Rom. i. 7, 1 Cor. i. 3, and Gal. i. 3.

teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God? For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written. Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision. Therefore, if the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision? And shall not uncircumcision which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law? For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.”¹ Here he plainly showed in what sense he said, “Thou makest thy boast of God.” For undoubtedly if one who was truly a Jew made his boast of God in the way which grace demands (which is bestowed not for merit of works, but gratuitously), then his praise would be of God, and not of men. But they, in fact, were making their boast of God, as if they alone had deserved to receive His law, as the Psalmist said: “He did not the like to any nation, nor His judgments has He displayed to them.”² And yet, [strange to say,] they thought they were fulfilling the law of God by their righteousness, when they were rather breakers of it all the while. [The law,] accordingly, “wrought wrath”³ upon them, making sin abound, committed as it was by them who knew the law. For whoever did even what the law commanded, without the assistance of the Spirit of grace, acted through fear of punishment, not from love of righteousness. Hence in the sight of God that proceeded not from a good will, which in the sight of men appeared as a work; and such doers of the law were rather held guilty from the fact that God knew their inclination to commit sin, if only it were possible with impunity. Moreover, he calls that “the circumcision of the

¹ Rom. ii. 17-29.

² Ps. cxlvii. 20.

³ Rom. iv. 15.

heart" which is a will perfectly pure of all unlawful desire; and this is a state which comes not from the *letter* of the law, with its inculcation and threatening, but from the *Spirit's* assisting and healing influence. Such doers of the law have their praise not of men but of God, who by His grace provides the grounds on which they receive praise; of whom it is said, "My soul shall make her boast of the Lord;"¹ to whom also it is said, "My boast [or praise] shall be of Thee."² But not such are they who would have God praised because they are men; and themselves likewise, because they are righteous.

CHAP. 14.—*In what respect the Pelagians acknowledge God as the Author of our justification.*

"But," say they, "we do actually acknowledge God to be the Author of our righteousness, in that He gave the law, by the teaching of which we have been instructed how we ought to live." But they give no heed to what they read: "By [the deeds of] the law there shall no flesh be justified in the sight of God."³ This may indeed be possible before men, but not in His sight who looks into our very heart and will; where He sees that, although the man who fears the law keeps a certain precept, he would nevertheless rather do another thing if he were permitted. The apostle, however, would have nobody suppose that, in the passage just quoted from him, he had meant to say that none are justified by that law, which contains many precepts, under the figure of the ancient sacraments, and among them circumcision itself, which infants were commanded to receive on the eighth day after birth; he therefore immediately adds what law he meant, and says, "For by the law is the knowledge of sin."⁴ He refers them to that law of which he afterwards declares, "I had not known sin but by the law; for I had not known lust except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet."⁵ Now what means this but that "by the law comes the knowledge of sin?"

CHAP. 15. [IX.]—*The righteousness of God manifested by the law and the prophets.*

Here, perhaps, it may be said by that presumption of man, which is ignorant of the righteousness of God, and wishes to

¹ Ps. xxxiv. 2.

² Ps. xxii. 25.

³ Rom. iii. 20.

⁴ Rom. iii. 20.

⁵ Rom. vii. 7.

establish one of its own, that the apostle was quite correct in saying, "For by the law shall no man be justified,"¹ inasmuch as the law merely shows what one ought to do, and what one ought to guard against, in order that what the law thus points out may be accomplished by the will, and so man be justified, not indeed by the power of the law, but by his freedom of will. But I ask your attention, vain man, to what follows. "Now the righteousness of God," says he, "without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets."² Does this then sound a light thing in deaf ears? He says, "The righteousness of God is manifested." Now this righteousness is ignored by those who wish to set up one of their own; they will not submit themselves to it.³ His words are, "*The righteousness of God is manifested:*" he does not say, the righteousness of man, or the righteousness of his will, but the "*righteousness of God,*"—meaning not that whereby He is Himself righteous, but that with which He endows man when He justifies the ungodly. This is witnessed by the law and the prophets; in other words, the law and the prophets each afford it their separate testimony. The law, indeed, by issuing its commands and threats, and yet justifying no man, clearly shows in that very circumstance that it is by God's gift, through the help of the Spirit, that a man is justified; and the prophets, because it is in accordance with what they predicted, that Christ at His coming accomplished it. Accordingly he advances a step further, and adds, "The righteousness of God is by faith of Jesus Christ,"⁴ that is, by the faith wherewith one believes in Christ; for *here* is not meant the faith with which Christ Himself believes, just as *there* was not meant the righteousness whereby God is Himself righteous. Both no doubt are ours, but yet they are called [in one case] God's, and [in the other] Christ's, because it is by their bounty that these gifts are bestowed upon us. The righteousness of God then is without the law, but not manifested without the law; for if it were manifested without the law, how could it be witnessed by the law? That righteousness of God, however, is without the law, which God by the Spirit of grace bestows on the believer without the

¹ Rom. iii. 20.² Rom. iii. 21.³ Rom. x. 3.⁴ Rom. iii. 22.

help of the law,—that is, who is not assisted by the law. When, indeed, He by the law discovers to a man his weakness, it is in order that by faith he may flee for refuge to His mercy, and be healed of his infirmity. Concerning His wisdom we are told, that “she carries law and mercy upon her tongue,”¹—the “law,” whereby she may convict the proud and lofty; the “mercy,” wherewith she may justify them when humbled. “The righteousness of God,” then, “by faith of Jesus Christ, is unto all that believe; for there is no difference, inasmuch as all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God”²—not of their own glory. For what have they, which they have not received? Now if they received it, why do they glory as if they had not received it?³ Well, then, they come short of the glory of God; now observe what follows: “Being justified freely by His grace.”⁴ It is not, therefore, by the law, nor is it by their own will, that they are justified; but they are justified *freely by God’s grace*,—not that the justification ensues without our will; but our will is by the law shown to be weak, that grace may heal its infirmity; and that being thus healed, our will may fulfil the law, not as constituted under the law, nor indeed as wanting the law.

CHAP. 16. [x.]—*How the law was not made for a righteous man; grace justifies freely; the law of faith.*

Because “for a righteous man the law was not made;”⁵ and yet “the law is good, if a man use it lawfully.”⁶ Now by connecting together these two seemingly contrary statements, the apostle warns and urges his reader to sift the question and solve it too. For how can it be that “the law is good, if a man use it lawfully,” if what follows is also true: “Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man?”⁷ For who but a righteous man lawfully uses the law? Yet it is not for him that it is made, but for the unrighteous. Must then the unrighteous man, in order that he may be justified,—that is, become a righteous man,—lawfully use the law, to lead him, as by the schoolmaster’s hand,⁸ to that grace by which alone he can fulfil what the law bids him do? Now it is

¹ Prov. iii. 16 (Septuagint).

⁴ Rom. iii. 24.

⁷ 1 Tim. i. 9.

² Rom. iii. 22, 23.

⁵ 1 Tim. i. 8.

⁸ Gal. iii. 24.

³ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

⁶ 1 Tim. i. 9.

freely or gratuitously that he is justified thereby,—that is, there are no antecedent merits of his own to earn the favour; “otherwise grace is no more grace,”¹ since it is bestowed on us, not because we have done good works, but that we may be able to do them,—in other words, not because we have fulfilled, but in order that we may be able to fulfil the law. Now He said, “I am come not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it,”² of whom it was said, “We have seen His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth.”³ This is the *glory* which is meant in the words, “All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;”⁴ and this the *grace* of which he speaks in the next verse, “Being justified freely by His grace.”⁵ The unrighteous man therefore lawfully uses the law, that he may become righteous; but when he has become so, he must no longer use it as a chariot, for he has arrived at his journey’s end,—or rather (that I may employ the apostle’s own simile, which has been already mentioned) as a schoolmaster, seeing that he is now fully learned. How then is the law not made for a righteous man, if it is even necessary for the righteous man, not that he may be brought as an unrighteous man to the grace that justifies, but that he may use it lawfully, now that he is righteous? Or does not the case perhaps stand thus? *Perhaps*, did I say? should I not rather say, *certainly* stand thus?—The man who is become righteous thus lawfully uses the law, when he applies it to alarm the unrighteous, so that whenever the disease of some unusual desire begins in them, too, to be augmented by the incentive of the law’s prohibition and an increased amount of transgression, they may in faith flee for refuge to the grace that justifies, and becoming delighted with the sweet pleasures of holiness, may escape the penalty of the law’s menacing letter through the spirit’s soothing gift. In this way the two statements will not be contrary, nor will they be repugnant to each other: even the righteous man may lawfully use a good law, and yet the law be not made for the righteous man; for it is not by the law that he becomes righteous, but by the law of faith, which led him to believe

¹ Rom. xi. 6.² Matt. v. 17.³ John i. 14.⁴ Rom. iii. 23.⁵ Rom. iii. 24.

that no other resource was possible to his weakness for fulfilling the precepts of the law of human conduct, than being assisted by the grace of God.

CHAP. 17.—*Concerning the "exclusores," or workers in silver.*

Accordingly he says, "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith."¹ He must either mean, that boasting is laudable, when it is in the Lord; and that it is *excluded*, not in the sense of shut out and driven away, but of standing out prominently as when carved. Whence certain artificers in silver are called "*exclusores*." In this sense occurs that passage in the Psalms: "That they may be *excluded*, who have been proved with silver,"²—that is, that they may stand out in prominence, who have been tried by the word [or oracle] of God. So in another passage it is said: "The words [or oracles] of the Lord are pure words, as silver which is tried in the fire."³ Or if this be not his meaning, he must have wished to mention that vicious boasting which comes of pride—that is, the glorying of those persons who, appearing to themselves to lead righteous lives, boast of their excellence, just as if they had not received it,—and further to inform us, that by the law of faith, not by the law of works, this boasting was *excluded*, in the other sense of shut out and driven away; because by the law of faith every one learns that whatever good life he leads he has from the grace of God, and that from no other source whatever can he obtain the means of fulfilling his course in the love of righteousness.

CHAP. 18. [XI.]—*Piety is wisdom; the sacrifice of the New Testament; the apostle a vigorous defender of grace; that is called the righteousness of God, which He produces.*

Now, meditating upon this makes a man godly, and this godliness is true wisdom. By godliness I mean that which the Greeks designate *θεοσέβεια*,—that very virtue which is commended to man in the passage of Job, where it is said to him, "Behold, godliness is wisdom."⁴ Now if the word *θεοσέβεια* be interpreted according to its derivation, it might be called

¹ Rom. iii. 27.

³ Ps. xii. 6.

² Ps. lxxviii. 30 (Septuagint).

⁴ Job xxviii. 28.

“*the worship of God;*”¹ and in this worship the essential point is, that the soul be not ungrateful to Him. Whence it is that in the most true and excellent sacrifice [of the gospel] we are admonished to “give thanks unto our Lord God.”² Ungrateful, however, our soul would be, were it to attribute to itself that which it has received from God, especially its righteousness, with the works of which (the especial property, as it were, of itself, and produced, so to speak, by the soul itself for itself) it is not puffed up in a vulgar pride, as if they were the result of riches, or of beauty of limb, or of eloquence, or of those other accomplishments, external or internal, bodily or mental, which even wicked men are in the habit of possessing, although it is, if I may say so, proud of them in a wise complacency, as of things which constitute in an especial manner the good works of the good. It is owing to this sin of vulgar pride that even some great men have drifted from the sure anchorage of the divine nature, and have floated down into the dishonours of idolatry. Whence the apostle again in the same epistle, wherein he so firmly maintains the principle of grace, after saying that he was a debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, to the wise and to the unwise, and professing himself ready, so far as to him pertained, to preach the gospel even to those who lived in Rome, adds: “I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.”³ This is the righteousness of God, which was veiled in the Old Testament, and is revealed in the New. It is called *the righteousness of God*, because by His bestowal of it He makes us righteous. In like manner we read that “salvation is the Lord’s,”⁴ because He saves by it. And this is the faith “from which” and “to which” it is revealed,—even *from the faith* of them who preach it, *to the faith* of those who obey it. By this faith of Jesus Christ—I mean the faith which Christ has given to us—we believe it is from God that

¹ *Cultus Dei* is Augustine’s Latin expression for the synonym.

² One of the suffrages of the *Sursum Corda* in the Communion Service.

³ Rom. i. 14–17.

⁴ Ps. iii. 8.

we now have, and shall have more and more, the ability of living righteously; wherefore we give Him thanks with that dutiful reverence with which He only is to be worshipped.

CHAP. 19. [XII.]—*The knowledge of God through the creation.*

And then the apostle very properly turns from this point to describe with detestation those men who, light-minded and puffed up by the sin which I have mentioned in the preceding chapter, have been carried away of their own conceit, as it were, through the empty space where they could find no resting-place, only to fall shattered to pieces against the vain figments of their idols, as against the stones. For, after he had commended the piety of that faith, whereby, being justified, we must needs be pleasing to God, he proceeds to call our attention to what we ought to abominate as the opposite. "For the wrath of God," says he, "is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; because that which may be known of God is manifest in them: for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him are clearly seen from the creation of the world, being understood through the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse: because, knowing God, they yet glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools; and they changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and to creeping things."¹ Observe, he does not say that they were ignorant of the truth, but that they held the truth in unrighteousness. It struck him, indeed, that he would inquire whence the knowledge of the truth might be obtained by those to whom God had not given the law; and he was not silent on the source of their information: for he declares that it was through the visible works of creation that they arrived at the knowledge of the invisible attributes of the Creator. And, in very deed, as they continued to possess great faculties of investigation, so in these they had the means

¹ Rom. i. 18-23.

of discovering the truth. Wherein then lay their unrighteousness? In the fact that, when they had found out God, they glorified Him not as God, nor gave Him thanks, but became vain in their imaginations. Vanity is a disease which especially characterizes those persons who mislead themselves, and "think themselves to be something, when they are nothing."¹ Such men, indeed, darken themselves in that swelling pride, the foot of which the Psalmist prays that it may not come against him,² after saying, "In Thy light shall we see light;"³ and from the very light of unchanging truth they turn aside, and "their foolish heart is darkened."⁴ For theirs was not a wise heart, even though they had found out God; but it was foolish, because they did not glorify Him as God, or give Him thanks; for "He said unto man, Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom."⁵ So by this conduct, while "professing themselves to be wise" (which can only be understood to mean that they attributed this quality absolutely to themselves), "they became fools."⁶

CHAP. 20.—*The law without grace.*

Now why need I speak of what follows? Those men, indeed, by this their impiety—I mean those who might have known the Creator through the creature—fell irretrievably; and where they fell, there (since "God resisteth the proud"⁷) they sank into the very depths of ruin. All this is better shown in the sequel of this epistle than we can here mention. For in this letter of mine we have not undertaken to expound this epistle [to the Romans], but only to demonstrate, so far as we are able (relying mainly on its authority), that we are assisted by divine aid towards the achievement of righteousness,—not by the circumstance that God has given us a law full of good and holy precepts, but because our very will, without which we cannot do any good thing, is assisted and elevated by the Spirit of grace being imparted to us, without whose help the teaching [of the law] is nothing more than "the letter that killeth,"⁸ forasmuch as it holds them guilty

¹ Gal. vi. 3.

² Ps. xxxvi. 11.

³ Ps. xxxvi. 9.

⁴ Rom. i. 21.

⁵ Job xxviii. 28.

⁶ Rom. i. 22.

⁷ Jas. iv. 6.

⁸ 2 Cor. iii. 6.

of transgressing it, instead of justifying the ungodly. Now just as those discoverers of the Creator by the creature received no benefit towards salvation, even from their discovery,—because “though they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, nor gave Him thanks, while professing themselves to be wise,”¹—so also they who discover from the law how man ought to live, are not made righteous by their discovery, because, “going about to establish their own righteousness, they have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.”²

CHAP. 21. [XIII.]—*The law of works and the law of faith.*

The law, then, of human action, that is, the law of works, whereby this self-glorification is not excluded, and the law of faith, by which it is excluded, differ from each other; and this difference it is worth our while to consider, if so be we are able to observe and discern it. Cursorily, indeed, one might say that the law of works lay in Judaism, and the law of faith in Christianity; forasmuch as circumcision and the other works prescribed by the law are just those which the Christian system no longer retains. But there is a fallacy in this distinction, the greatness of which I have for some time been endeavouring to expose; and to such as are shrewd in appreciating distinctions, especially to yourself and those who share in your intelligence, I have possibly succeeded in my effort. Since, however, the subject is an important one, it will not be unsuitable, if with a view to its illustration, we linger over the many testimonies which again and again meet our view. Now, although the apostle says that by the law no man is justified,³ and declares that it entered that the offence might abound,⁴ yet in order to save it from the aspersions of the ignorant and the accusations of the impious, he defends this very law in words such as these: “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known concupiscence, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.”⁵ He says also: “The law

¹ Rom. i. 21.

² Rom. x. 3.

³ Rom. iii. 20.

⁴ Rom. v. 20.

⁵ Rom. vii. 7, 8.

indeed is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good; but sin, that it might appear sin, worked death in me by that which is good."¹ It is therefore the very letter that kills, which says, "Thou shalt not covet." And of this law it is that he speaks in a passage which I have before referred to: "By the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ upon all them that believe; for there is no difference: seeing that all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God: being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, [I say,] His righteousness at this time; that so He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."² And then he adds the passage which is now under consideration: "Where, then, is your boasting? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith."³ And so it is the very law of works itself which says, "Thou shalt not covet;" because thereby comes the knowledge of sin. Now I wish to know, if anybody will have the courage to inform me, whether the law of faith says to us, "Thou shalt not covet," or not? For if it does not say so to us, what reason is there why we, who are placed under its sanction, should not sin in safety and with impunity? Indeed, this is just what those people thought the apostle meant, of whom he writes: "Even as some affirm that we say, Let us do evil, that good may come; whose damnation is just."⁴ If, on the contrary, it does say to us, "Thou shalt not covet" (even as numerous passages in the gospels and epistles⁵ so often testify and urge), then why is not this law also called the law of works? For it by no means follows that, because it retains not in its service the operations of the ancient sacraments,—even circumcision and the other ceremonies,—it therefore has no external duties⁶ comprised in its own sacraments, which are

¹ Rom. vii. 12, 13.² Rom. iii. 20-26.³ Rom. iii. 27.⁴ Rom. iii. 8.⁵ Apostolica.⁶ Opera.

well adapted to the present age ; at least there was a question about sacramental works, since the law was mentioned, because by it is the knowledge of sin, and so nobody is justified by it ; therefore it is not by it that boasting is excluded, but by the law of faith, whereby the just man lives. But is there not by it too the knowledge of sin, when even it says, "Thou shalt not covet?"

CHAP. 22.—*The law of works ; the law of faith ; Paul the most persevering preacher of grace ; the "child of faith."*

What the difference between them is, I will briefly explain. What the law of works enjoins by menace, that the law of faith secures by faith. The one says, "Thou shalt not covet ;"¹ the other uses such language as this : "When I perceived that nobody could have the gift of continence, unless God gave it to him ; and that this was the very point of wisdom : to know whose gift it was, I approached unto the Lord, and I besought Him."² This indeed is the very wisdom which is called *piety*, in which is worshipped "the Father of lights, from whom descends every good and perfect gift."³ This worship, however, consists in the sacrifice of praise and giving of thanks, so that the worshipper of God glories not in himself, but in Him.⁴ Accordingly, by the law of works, God says to us, Do what I command thee ; but by the law of faith we say to God, Give me what Thou commandest. Now this is the reason why the law gives its command, even to admonish us what faith ought to do,—in other words, that he to whom the command is given, if he is as yet unable to perform it, may know what he should ask for ; but if he has at once the ability, and complies with the command, he ought also to be aware from whose gift the ability comes. "We have received not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God."⁵ What, however, "is the spirit of this world," but the spirit of pride? By it their foolish heart is darkened, who, after knowing God, glorified Him not as God, by giving Him thanks.⁶ Moreover, it is really by this same spirit that they too are deceived, who, while ignorant of the righteousness

¹ Ex. xx. 17.

² Wisdom viii. 21.

³ Jas. i. 17.

⁴ 2 Cor. x. 17.

⁵ 1 Cor. ii. 12.

⁶ Rom. i. 21.

of God, and wishing to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted to God's righteousness.¹ It appears to me, therefore, that he is much more "a child of faith" who has learned from what source to expect assistance, than he who attributes to himself whatever he has; although, no doubt, to both of these must be preferred the man who possesses the gift, and at the same time knows from whom he has it. Suppose, however, that he does not believe himself to be what he has not yet attained to, let him not in such a case fall into the mistake of the Pharisee, who, while thanking God for what he possessed, failed to ask for any further gift, just as if he stood in want of nothing for the increase and perfection of his righteousness.² Now, having duly considered and weighed all these circumstances and testimonies, we conclude that a man is not justified by the precepts of a holy life, but by faith in Jesus Christ,—in a word, not by the law of works, but by the law of faith; not by the letter, but by the spirit; not by meritorious conduct, but by free grace.

CHAP. 23. [XIV.]—*How the Decalogue kills, if grace be not present.*

The apostle undoubtedly reproveth and corrects those who were prevailed on to accept circumcision, in such terms as to designate by the word "*law*" this rite of circumcision and other similar legal observances, which are now rejected as shadows of a future substance by Christians who yet hold what those shadows figuratively promised; although he at the same time would have it to be clearly understood that the law, by which he says no man is justified, lies not merely in those sacramental institutions which contained promissive figures, but also in those works which made the man who did them to live holily, and amongst which occurs this prohibition: "Thou shalt not covet." Now, to make our statement all the clearer, let us look at the Decalogue itself. It is certain, then, that Moses on the mount received the law, that he might deliver it to the people, written on tables of stone by the finger of God. It is summed up in ten commandments, in which there is no precept about circumcision, nor anything concerning those animal sacrifices which have ceased to be offered by Christians. Well, now, I should like to be told

¹ Rom. x. 3.

² Luke xviii. 11, 12.

what there is in these ten commandments, except that on the observance of the Sabbath, which ought not to be kept by a Christian,—whether it prohibit the making and worshipping of idols and of any other gods than the one true God, or the taking of God's name in vain; or prescribe honour to parents; or give warning against fornication, murder, theft, false witness, adultery, and coveting other men's property? Which of these commandments would any one say that the Christian ought not to keep? Or will it by any chance be contended that it is not the law which was written on those two tables that the apostle describes as "the letter that killeth," but the law of circumcision and the other sacred rites which are now abolished? But then how can we think so, when in the law occurs this precept, "Thou shalt not covet," by which very commandment, notwithstanding its being holy, just, and good, "sin," says the apostle, "deceived me, and by it slew me?"¹ What else can this be than "the letter" that "killeth?"

CHAP. 24.

In the passage where he speaks to the Corinthians about the letter that kills, and the spirit that gives life, he expresses himself more clearly, but he does not mean even there any other "letter" to be understood than the Decalogue itself, which was written on the two tables. His words are these: "Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart. And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more

¹ See Rom. vii. 7-12.

shall the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory."¹ A good deal might be said about these words; but perhaps we shall have a more fitting opportunity at some future time. At present, however, I beg you to observe how he speaks of the letter that killeth, and contrasts therewith the spirit that giveth life. Now this must certainly be the same as "the ministration of death written and engraven in stones," and as "the ministration of condemnation," since the law entered that sin might abound.² But the commandments themselves are so useful and salutary to the doer of them, that unless they were kept by him, he could not possibly have life. Well, then, is it owing to the one precept about the Sabbath-day, which is included amongst them, that the Decalogue is called "the letter that killeth?" Because, forsooth, every man that still observes that commandment in its literal appointment is carnally wise, but to be carnally wise is nothing else than death? And must the other nine commandments, when rightly observed just in their literal shape also, not be regarded as belonging to the law of works by which none is justified, but to the law of faith whereby the just man lives? Who can possibly entertain so absurd an opinion as to suppose that "the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," is not said equally of all the ten commandments, but only of the solitary one touching the Sabbath-day? In which class do we place that which is thus spoken of: "The law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression?"³ and again thus: "Until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law?"⁴ and also that which we have already so often quoted: "By the law is the knowledge of sin?"⁵ and especially the passage in which the apostle has more clearly expressed the question of which we are treating: "I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet?"⁶

CHAP. 25.

Now carefully consider this entire passage, and see whether it says anything about circumcision, or the Sabbath, or any-

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 8-9.² Rom. v. 20.³ Rom. iv. 15.⁴ Rom. v. 13.⁵ Rom. iii. 20.⁶ Rom. vii. 7.

thing else pertaining to a foreshadowing sacrament. Does not its whole scope amount to this, that the letter which forbids sin fails to give man life, but rather "killeth," by increasing concupiscence, and aggravating our sinfulness by transgression, unless indeed grace liberates us by the law of faith, which is in Christ Jesus, when His love is "shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us?"¹ The apostle having at the outset of the passage used these words: "That we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter,"² goes on to inquire, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay; I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, worked death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual; whereas I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that I do. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. But then it is no longer I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing. To will, indeed, is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that which I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin

¹ Rom. v. 5.² Rom. vii. 6.

which is in my members. O wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me from the body of this death ? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin."¹

CHAP. 26.—*The commandment is not kept, if the sole motive of its observance be the fear of punishment.*

It is evident, then, that the oldness of the letter, in the absence of the newness of the spirit, instead of freeing us from sin, rather makes us guilty by the knowledge of sin. Whence it is written in another part of Scripture, "He that increaseth knowledge, increaseth sorrow,"²—not that the law is itself evil, but because the commandment has its good in the demonstration of the letter, not in the assistance of the spirit; and if this commandment is kept from the fear of punishment and not from the love of righteousness, there is only servility and not freedom in such observance, and therefore it is in truth not kept at all. For no fruit is good which does not grow from the root of love. If, however, that faith be present which worketh by love,³ then one begins to delight in the law of God after the inward man,⁴ and this delight is the gift of the spirit, not of the letter; [moreover, this joyous feeling, thus begun, continues] even though there is another law in our members still warring against the law of the mind, until the old state is changed and passes into that new condition which increases from day to day in the inward man, whilst the grace of God liberates us from the body of this death through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAP. 27. [XV.]—*The grace which was latent in the Old Testament is revealed in the New; what the observation of the Sabbath signified.*

This grace lay hid under a veil in the Old Testament, but it has been revealed in the New Testament according to the most perfectly ordered dispensation of the ages, forasmuch as God knew how to appoint all things in their several places. And perhaps it is in reference to this very secret ordinance of God, that in the Decalogue, which was given on Mount Sinai, the portion which relates to the Sabbath was simply hidden under a prefiguring precept. The Sabbath is a day set apart

¹ Rom. vii. 7-25.

² Eccles. i. 18.

³ Gal. v. 6.

⁴ Rom. vii. 22.

for holy purposes; and it is not without significance that, among all the works which God accomplished, the first sound of sanctification or holiness was heard on the day when He rested from all His labours. On this, indeed, we must not now enlarge. But at the same time I deem it to be not inapplicable to the point now in question, that it was not for nothing that the nation was commanded on that day to abstain from all servile work, by which sin is signified; [the precept so ran] only because not to commit sin belongs to sanctification, that is, to God's gift through the Holy Spirit. Now this precept in the law, which was written on the two tables of stone, was placed among the others only in a prefiguring shadow, under which the Jews observe their Sabbath-day, that by this very circumstance it might be signified that it was then the time for hiding and concealing the grace, which had to be revealed and discovered in the New Testament by the death of Christ,—the rending, as it were, of the veil.¹ “For when,” says the apostle, “it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.”²

CHAP. 28. [XVI.]—*The Holy Ghost, why called the finger of God.*

“Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”³ Now this Spirit of God by whose gift we are justified, whence it comes to pass that we rejoice, in that we sin not,—a state of liberty; even as, when we are without this Spirit, it delights us to sin,—a condition of slavery, from the works of which it is incumbent on us to abstain;—this Holy Spirit, [I say,] through whom love is shed abroad in our hearts, which is the fulfilment of the law, is designated in the gospel as “the finger of God.”⁴ Is it not because those very tables of the law were written by the finger of God, that the Spirit of God by whom we are sanctified is also *the finger of God*, in order that, living by faith, we may do good works through love? Who is not touched by the congruity [of the idea,] and at the same time not regardless of the diversity implied therein? For as fifty days are reckoned from the celebration of the Passover (which was ordered by Moses to be offered by slaying the typical lamb,⁵ to signify,

¹ Matt. xxvii. 51.

² 2 Cor. iii. 16.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 17.

⁴ Luke xi. 20.

⁵ Ex. xii. 3.

indeed, the future death of the Lord) to the day when Moses received the law written on the tables of stone by the finger of God,¹ so, in like manner, from the death and resurrection of Him who was led as a lamb to the slaughter,² there were fifty complete days up to the time when the finger of God—that is, the Holy Spirit—gathered together in one³ perfect company those who believed [in the Lord Jesus Christ.]

CHAP. 29. [XVII.]—*A comparison of the law of Moses and of the new law.*

Now, amidst this admirable correspondence, there is at least this very considerable diversity in the cases, in that the people in the earlier instance were deterred by a horrible dread from approaching the place where the law was given; whereas in the other case the Holy Ghost came upon them who were gathered together in expectation of His promised gift. *There* it was on tables of stone that the finger of God operated; *here* it was on the hearts of men. *There* it was outwardly that the law was registered, so that the unrighteous were terrified by it;⁴ *here* it was inwardly given, so that we might be justified by it.⁵ “For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment,”—such, of course, as was written on those tables,—“it is briefly comprehended,” says he, “in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.”⁶ Now this was not written on the tables of stone, but “is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us.”⁷ God’s law, therefore, is love. “To it the carnal mind is not subject, neither indeed can be.”⁸ When, however, the works of love are written on tables to alarm the carnal mind, there arises the law of works and “the letter which killeth” the transgressor; but when love itself is shed abroad in the hearts of believers, then we have the law of faith, and the spirit which gives life to him that loves.

CHAP. 30.

Now, observe how consonant this diversity is with those words of the apostle which I quoted not long ago in another

¹ Ex. xxxi. 18.

² Isa. liii. 7.

³ Acts ii. 2.

⁴ Ex. xix. 12, 16.

⁵ Acts ii. 1-47.

⁶ Rom. xiii. 9, 10.

⁷ Rom. v. 5.

⁸ Rom. viii. 7.

connection, and which I postponed for a more careful consideration afterwards: "Forasmuch," says he, "as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart."¹ See how he shows that the one is written externally to man, that it may alarm him from without; the other within man himself, that it may justify him from within. He speaks of the "fleshy tables of the heart," not of the carnal mind, but of a living agent possessing sensation, in comparison with a stone, which is senseless. The assertion which he subsequently makes,—that "the children of Israel could not look stedfastly into the face of Moses," and that he accordingly spoke to them through a veil,²—signifies that the letter of the law justifies no man, but that rather a veil overspreads the mind in reading the Old Testament, until it turns to Christ, and the veil is removed;—in other words, until the mind resorts to grace, and understands that from Him accrues to us the justification, whereby we do what He commands; and His commandment He gives us, in order that while failing in ourselves, we may flee to Him for refuge. Accordingly, after most guardedly making this admission, "Such trust have we through Christ to God-ward,"³ the apostle immediately goes on to add the statement which underlies our subject, to prevent our confidence being attributed to any strength of our own. He says: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God; who also hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."⁴

CHAP. 31. [XVIII.]—*The old law ministers death; the new, righteousness.*

Now, since, as he says in another passage, "the law was added because of transgressions,"⁵ meaning the law which is written externally to man, he therefore designates it both as "the ministration of death,"⁶ and "the ministration of condemnation;"⁷ but the other, that is, the law of the New

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 3.

² 2 Cor. iii. 13.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 4.

⁴ 2 Cor. iii. 5, 6.

⁵ Gal. iii. 19.

⁶ 2 Cor. iii. 7.

⁷ 2 Cor. iii. 9.

Testament, he calls "the ministration of the spirit"¹ and "the ministration of righteousness;"² because through the spirit we work righteousness, and are delivered from the condemnation due to transgression. The one, therefore, vanishes away; the other abides, for the terrifying schoolmaster will be dispensed with, when love has succeeded to fear. Now "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."³ This ministration, however, is vouchsafed to us, as the apostle says, not on account of our deserving, but from His mercy. "Seeing then that we have this ministry, as we have received mercy, let us faint not; but let us renounce the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor handling the word of God deceitfully."⁴ By this "craftiness" and "deceitfulness" he would have us understand the hypocrisy with which the proud and arrogant would fain be supposed to be righteous. Whence in the psalm, which the apostle cites in testimony of this very grace of God, it is said, "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin, and in whose mouth is no guile."⁵ This is the confession of lowly saints, who do not boast to be what they are not. Then, in a passage which follows not long after, the apostle writes thus: "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."⁶ This is the knowledge of His glory, whereby we know that He is the light which illumines our darkness. And I beg you to observe how he inculcates this very point: "We have," says he, "this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency of the power may be of God, and not of us."⁷ Then further on he commends in glowing terms this same grace, in the Lord Jesus Christ, until he comes to that vestment of the righteousness of faith, "clothed with which we cannot be found naked," and whilst longing for which "we groan, being burdened" with mortality, "earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from Heaven," "that mortality might be swallowed

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 8.² 2 Cor. iii. 9.³ 2 Cor. iii. 17.⁴ 2 Cor. iv. 1, 2.⁵ Ps. xxxii. 2.⁶ 2 Cor. iv. 5, 6.⁷ 2 Cor. iv. 7.

up of life.”¹ Observe what he then says: “Now He that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God, who also hath given unto us the earnest of the Spirit;”² and by and by he thus briefly draws the conclusion of the matter: “That we might be made the righteousness of God in Him,”³—this being not the righteousness whereby God is Himself righteous, but that whereby we are made righteous by Him.

CHAP. 32. [XIX.]—*The Christian faith touching the assistance of grace.*

Let no Christian then stray from this faith, which alone is the Christian one; and, in case any one should feel ashamed to say that we become righteous through our own selves, without the grace of God working in us,—because he sees, when such an allegation is made, how unable pious believers are to endure it,—let him not resort to any subterfuge on this point, by affirming that the reason why we cannot become righteous without the operation of God’s grace is this, that He gave the law, He instituted its teaching, He commanded its precepts of good. No doubt, without His assisting grace, it is “the letter which killeth;” but when the life-giving spirit is present, the law causes that to be loved as written within, which it once caused to be feared as written without.

CHAP. 33.—*The prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the New Testament.*

Observe how this is also [declared] in that testimony which was given by the prophet on this subject in the most emphatic way: “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will consummate a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt. Because they continued not in my covenant, I also have rejected them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for

¹ See 2 Cor. v. 1-4.

² 2 Cor. v. 5.

³ 2 Cor. v. 21.

they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them; saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."¹ What say we to this? One nowhere, or hardly anywhere, except in this passage of the prophet, finds in the Old Testament Scriptures any mention so made of the New Testament as to indicate it in so many words. It is no doubt often referred to and foretold as about to be given, but not so plainly as to have its very name mentioned. Consider then carefully, what difference God has testified as existing between the two testaments—the old covenant and the new.

CHAP. 34.—*The law; grace.*

After saying, "Not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt," observe the addition which He makes: "Because they continued not in my covenant." He reckons it as their own fault that they did not continue in God's covenant [or testament,] lest the law, which they received at that time, should seem to be deserving of blame. For it was the very law that Christ "came not to destroy, but to fulfil."² Nevertheless, it is not by that law that the ungodly are made righteous, but by grace; and this change is effected by the life-giving Spirit, without whom the letter kills. "For if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe,"³—out of which promise, that is, from the kindness of God, the law is fulfilled, which, however, without the said promise only makes men transgressors, either by the actual commission of some sinful deed, if the flame of concupiscence have greater power than even the restraints of fear, or at least by their mere will, if the fear of punishment transcend the pleasure of lust. In what he says, "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe," it is the benefit of the actual "*conclusion*" which is asserted.

¹ Jer. xxxi. 31–34.

² Matt. v. 17.

³ Gal. iii. 21, 22.

For to what purposes "*hath it concluded,*" except as it is expressed in the next sentence: "Before, indeed, faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up [*or concluded*] for the faith which was afterwards revealed?"¹ The law was therefore given, in order that grace might be sought; grace was given, in order that the law might be fulfilled. Now it was not through any fault of its own that the law was not fulfilled, but by the fault of the carnal mind; and this fault was to be demonstrated by the law, and healed by grace. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."² Accordingly, in the passage which we cited from the prophet, he says, "I will consummate a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah."³ Now what means *I will consummate* but *I will fulfil*? "Not, [he goes on to say,] according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt."⁴

CHAP. 35. [XX.].—*The old law; the new law.*

The one [covenant or testament] was therefore old, because the other is new. But whence comes it that one is old and the other new, if the same law, which said in the Old Testament, "Thou shalt not covet,"⁵ is fulfilled by the New Testament? "Because," says the prophet, "they continued not in my covenant, I have also rejected them, saith the Lord."⁶ It is then on account of the hurt done by the old man, which was by no means healed by the letter which commanded and threatened, that it is called the old testament [or covenant;] whereas the other is called the new testament [or covenant,] because of the newness of the spirit, which heals the new man of the fault of the old. Then consider what follows, and see in how clear a light the fact is placed, that men who have faith are unwilling to trust in themselves: "Because," says he, "this is the covenant which I will make

¹ Gal. iii. 23.

⁴ Jer. xxxi. 32.

² Rom. viii. 3, 4.

⁵ Ex. xx. 17.

³ Jer. xxxi. 31.

⁶ Jer. xxxi. 32.

with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts."¹ See how similarly the apostle states it in the passage we have already quoted: "Not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart,"² because [written] "not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God."³ And I apprehend that the apostle in this passage had no other reason for mentioning "the New Testament" ("who hath made us able ministers of *the New Testament*; not of the letter, but of the spirit"), than because he had an eye to the words of the prophet, when he said, "Not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart," inasmuch as in the prophet it runs: "I will write it in their hearts."⁴

CHAP. 36. [XXI.]—*The law written in our hearts.*

What then is God's law written by God Himself in the hearts of men, but the very presence of the Holy Spirit, who is "the finger of God," and by whose presence is shed abroad in our hearts the love which is the fulfilling of the law,⁵ and the end of the commandment?⁶ Now the promises of the Old Testament are earthly; and yet (with the exception of the sacramental ordinances which were the shadow of things to come, such as circumcision, the Sabbath and other observances of days, and the ceremonies of certain meats,⁷ and the complicated ritual of sacrifices and sacred things which suited "the oldness" of the carnal law and its slavish yoke) it contains such precepts of righteousness as we are even now taught to observe, especially those which were expressly drawn out on the two tables without figure or shadow: for instance, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt do no murder," "Thou shalt not covet,"⁸ "and whatsoever other commandment is briefly comprehended in the saying, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;"⁹—nevertheless, as in the said Testament earthly and temporal promises are, as I have said, recited, and these are goods of this corruptible flesh (although they prefigure those heavenly and everlasting blessings which

¹ Jer. xxxi. 33.

⁴ Jer. xxxi. 33.

⁷ See *Retractations*, ii. 37.

² 2 Cor. iii. 3.

⁵ Rom. xiii. 10.

⁸ Ex. xx. 13, 14, 17.

³ 2 Cor. iii. 3.

⁶ 1 Tim. i. 5.

⁹ Rom. xiii. 9.

belong to the New Testament), what is now promised is blessing for the heart itself, blessing for the mind, blessing of the spirit, in other words, a blessing for the understanding to appreciate; since it is said, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and in their hearts will I write them,"¹—by which He signified that men would not fear the law which alarmed them externally, but would love the very righteousness of the law which dwelt inwardly in their hearts.

CHAP. 37. [XXII.]—*The eternal reward.*

He then went on to state the reward to ensue: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people."² This corresponds to the Psalmist's words to God: "It is good for me to hold me fast by God."³ "I will be," says God, "their God, and they shall be my people." What is better than this blessing, what happier than this happiness,—to live to God, to live on God, with whom is the fountain of life, and in whose light we shall see light?⁴ Of this life the Lord Himself speaks in these words: "This is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent,"⁵—that is, "to know Thee and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent" as the one very God. For no less than this did [Christ] Himself promise to those who love Him: "He that loveth me, keepeth my commandments; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him,"⁶—in the form, no doubt, of God, wherein He is equal to the Father; not in the form of a servant, for in this He will display Himself even to the wicked also. Then indeed shall that come to pass which is written, "Let the ungodly man be taken away, that he see not the glory of the Lord."⁷ Then also shall "the wicked go into everlasting punishment, and the righteous into life eternal."⁸ Now this eternal life, as I have just mentioned, has been defined to be, that they may know the one true God.⁹ Accordingly John again says: "Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be:

¹ Jer. xxxi. 33.

⁴ Ps. xxxvi. 9.

⁷ Isa. xxvi. 10 (Septuagint).

² Jer. xxxi. 33.

⁵ John xvii. 3.

⁸ Matt. xxv. 46.

³ Ps. lxxiii. 28.

⁶ John xiv. 21.

⁹ John xvii. 3.

but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is."¹ This likeness begins even now to be recast in us, while the inward man is being renewed from day to day, according to the image of Him that created him.²

CHAP. 38. [XXIII.]—*The re-formation which is now being effected, compared with the perfection of the life to come.*

But what is this change, and how great, in comparison with the perfect eminence which is then to be realized? The apostle applies an illustration, such as it is, derived from well-known facts, to these indescribable subjects, comparing the period of childhood with the age of manhood. "When I was a child," says he, "I used to speak as a child, to understand as a child, to think as a child; but when I became a man, I put aside childish things."³ He then immediately explains why he said this in these words: "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then [we shall see] face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known."⁴

CHAP. 39. [XXIV.]—*The eternal reward which is specially declared in the New Testament, foretold by the prophet.*

Accordingly, in our prophet likewise, whose testimony we are dealing with, there is this additional statement, that in God is the reward, in Him the end, in Him the perfection of happiness, in Him the sum of the happy life eternal. For after saying, "I will be their God, and they shall be my people," he at once adds, "And they shall no more teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them."⁵ Well, the present is certainly the time of the new testament, the promise of which is given by the prophet in the words which we have quoted from his prophecy. Wherefore then does each man still say even now to his neighbour and his brother, "Know the Lord?" Or is it not perhaps meant that this is everywhere said when the gospel is preached, and when this is its very proclamation? For on what ground does the apostle call himself "a teacher

¹ 1 John iii. 2.

² Col. iii. 10.

³ 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

⁴ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

⁵ Jer. xxxi. 34.

of the Gentiles,"¹ if it be not that what he himself implies in the following passage becomes realized: "How shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?"² Since, then, this preaching is now everywhere spreading, in what way is it the time of the new testament of which the prophet spoke in the words, "And they shall not every man teach his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them,"³ unless it be that he has included in his prophetic forecast the eternal reward of the said new testament, by promising us the most blessed contemplation of God Himself?

CHAP. 40.—*How that is to be the reward of all; the apostle earnestly defends grace.*

What then is the import of the "All, from the least of them unto the greatest of them," but all that belong spiritually to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah,—that is, to the children of Isaac, to the seed of Abraham? For such is the promise, wherein it was said to him, "In Isaac shall thy seed be called; for they which are the children of the flesh are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son. And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac, (for the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him that calleth,) it was said unto her, The elder shall serve the younger."⁴ This is the house of Israel, or rather the house of Judah, on account of Christ, who came of the tribe of Judah. This is the house of the children of promise,—not by reason of their own merits, but of the kindness of God. For God promises what He Himself performs: He does not Himself promise, and another perform; which course of conduct would no longer be giving a promise, but uttering a prophecy. Hence it is "not of works, but of Him that calleth,"⁵

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 7.

² Rom. x. 14.

³ Jer. xxxi. 34.

⁴ Rom. ix. 7-12.

⁵ Rom. ix. 11.

lest the result should be their own, not God's; lest the reward should be ascribed not to His grace, but to their due; and so grace should be no longer that grace which was so earnestly defended and maintained by him who, though the least of the apostles, laboured more abundantly than all the rest,—not himself indeed, but the grace of God that was with him.¹ “They shall all know me,”² He says,—“All,” the house of Israel and house of Judah. “All,” however, “are not Israel which are of Israel,”³ but they only to whom it is said in “the psalm concerning the morning aid”⁴ (that is, concerning the new refreshing light, meaning that of the new testament), “All ye the seed of Jacob, glorify Him; and fear Him, all ye the seed of Israel.”⁵ All the seed, without exception, even the entire seed of the promise and of the called, but only of those who are the called according to His purpose.⁶ “For whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.”⁷ “Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law,”—that is, which comes from the Old Testament into the New,—“but to that also which is of faith,” which was indeed prior to the law, even “the faith of Abraham,”—meaning those who copy of Abraham,—“who is the father of us all; as it is written, I have made thee the father of many nations.”⁸ Now all these predestinated ones, who are also called, and justified, and glorified, shall know God by virtue of the new covenant or testament, from the least to the greatest of them.

CHAP. 41.—*The law written in the heart, and the reward of the eternal contemplation of God, belong to the new covenant; who among the saints are the least and the greatest.*

As then the law of works, which was written on the tables of stone, and its recompense, the land of promise, which the house of the carnal Israel after their liberation from Egypt received, belonged to the old testament, so the law of faith,

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10.

² Jer. xxxi. 34.

³ Rom. ix. 6.

⁴ See title of Ps. xxii. (xxi. Sept.) in the Sept.

⁵ Ps. xxii. 23.

⁶ Rom. viii. 28.

⁷ Rom. viii. 30.

⁸ Rom. iv. 16, 17.

written on the heart, and its reward, the beatific vision which the house of the spiritual Israel, when delivered from the present world, shall perceive, belong to the new testament. Then shall come to pass the issue which the apostle describes: "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away,"¹—even that imperfect knowledge of "the child"² in which this present life is passed, and which is but "in part," and "through a glass," and "as an enigma."³ Because of this, indeed, "prophecy" is necessary, for still to the past succeeds the future; and because of this, too, "tongues" are required,—that is, a multiplicity of expressive signs,—since it is by successive signs that a succession of ideas is suggested to him who does not as yet contemplate with a perfectly purified mind the everlasting light of transparent truth. "When that, however, which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away,"⁴ because then what appeared to the flesh in assumed flesh shall display Itself as It is in Itself to all who love It; then it shall be eternal life for us to know the one very God;⁵ then shall we be like Him,⁶ because "we shall then know, even as we are known,"⁷ then "they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, [saith the Lord.]"⁸ Now this may be understood in several ways: Either, that in that life the saints shall differ one from another in glory, as star from star. It matters not how the expression runs,—whether (as in the passage before us) it be, "From the least of them unto the greatest of them," or the other way, From the greatest unto the least. And, in like manner, it matters not even if we understand "*the least*" to mean those who simply believe, and "*the greatest*" those who have been further able to understand—so far as may be in this world—the light which is incorporeal and unchangeable. Or, "*the least*" may mean those who are later in time; whilst by "*the greatest*" He may

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 8.

² *Ib.* ver. 11.

³ *Ib.* ver. 12 [*ἐν αἰνίγματι* = "darkly"].

⁴ 1 Cor. xiii. 10.

⁵ John xvii. 3.

⁶ 1 John iii. 2.

⁷ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

⁸ Jer. xxxi. 34.

have intended to indicate those who were prior in time. For they are all to receive the promised vision of God hereafter, since it was for us that they foresaw the future which would be better than their present, that they without us should not arrive at complete perfection.¹ And so the earlier are found to be the lesser, because they were less deferred in time; as in the case of the gospel "penny a day," which is given for an illustration.² This penny they are the first to receive who came last into the vineyard. Or, "the least and the greatest" ought perhaps to be taken in some other sense, which at present does not occur to my mind.

CHAP. 42. [XXV.]—*Difference between the old and the new testaments.*

I beg of you, however, carefully to observe, as far as you can, the point which I am endeavouring to prove with so much effort. When the prophet promised a new covenant [or testament], not according to the covenant which had been formerly made with Israel when liberated from Egypt, he said nothing about a change in the sacrifices or any sacred ordinances, although such change was no doubt to follow, as we see in fact that it did follow; even as the same prophetic scripture testifies in many other passages; but he simply called attention to the point of difference [between the testaments,]—how that God would impress His laws on the mind of those who pertained to this covenant, and would write them in their hearts;³ and hence the apostle drew his conclusion,—“not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart;”⁴ and how that the eternal recompense of this righteousness was not the land out of which were driven the Amorites and Hittites, and other nations who dwelt there,⁵ but God Himself, “to whom it is good to hold us fast,”⁶ in order that God Himself, who is the object of their love, may be the good in God which they love, between whom and men nothing but sin produces separation; and it is only by grace that sin is remitted. Accordingly, after saying, “For all shall know me, from the least to the greatest of them,” He instantly added, “For I will forgive

¹ Heb. xi. 40.

⁴ 2 Cor. iii. 3.

² Matt. xx. 8.

⁵ Josh. xii.

³ Jer. xxxi. 32, 33.

⁶ Ps. lxxiii. 28.

their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.”¹ By the law of works, then, the Lord says, “Thou shalt not covet,”² but by the law of faith He says, “Without me ye can do nothing;”³ for there the Lord was treating of good works, even the fruit of the vine-branches. It is therefore apparent what difference there is between the old covenant and the new,—that in the former the law is written on material tables, while in the latter it is engraven on men’s hearts; so that what in the one alarms from without, in the other delights from within; and while man in the former becomes a transgressor through the letter that kills, in the other he takes to loving through the life-giving spirit. But for all that we must avoid saying, that the way in which God assists us to work righteousness, and “works in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure,”⁴ is by externally addressing to our faculties precepts of holiness; for He gives His increase internally,⁵ by shedding love abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us.⁶

CHAP. 43. [XXVI.]—*A question touching the passage in the apostle about the Gentiles who are said to do by nature the law’s commands, which they are also said to have written on their hearts.*

Now we must see in what sense it is that the apostle says, “For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts,”⁷ lest there should seem to be no certain difference in the new testament, when the Lord promised that He would write His laws in the hearts of His people, inasmuch as the Gentiles indeed have this done for them naturally. This question therefore has to be sifted, arising as it does as one of no inconsiderable importance. For a man may say, If God distinguishes the new testament from the old by this circumstance, that in the old He wrote His law on tables, but in the new He wrote them on men’s hearts, by what are the faithful of the new testament discriminated from the Gentiles, which have the work of the law written on their hearts, whereby they do by nature the things

¹ Jer. xxxi. 34.

² Ex. xx. 17.

³ John xv. 5.

⁴ Phil. ii. 13.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

⁶ Rom. v. 5.

⁷ Rom. ii. 14, 15.

of the law,¹ as if, forsooth, they were better than the ancient nation, which received the law on tables, and in advance of the new nation, which has that conferred on it by the new testament which nature has already bestowed on *them*?

CHAP. 44.—*The answer is, that the passage must be understood of the faithful of the new covenant.*

Perhaps, however, they whom the apostle mentioned as having the law written in their hearts were those Gentiles who belong to the new testament. Now we must see whence this view arises. First, then, referring to the gospel, he says, "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith."² He goes on to speak of the ungodly, who by reason of their pride profit not by the knowledge of God, since they did not glorify Him as God, neither were thankful.³ He then passes to those who think and do the very things which they condemn,—having in view, no doubt, the Jews, who made their boast of God's law, but as yet not mentioning them expressly by name; and then he says, "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile: but glory, honour, and peace, to every soul that doeth good; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law; for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."⁴ Who they are that are treated of in these words, he goes on to tell us: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law,"⁵ and so forth in the passage which I have quoted already. Evidently, therefore, no others are here signified under the name of Gentiles than those whom he had before designated by the name of "Greek" when he said, "To the Jew first, and also to the Greek."⁶ Since then the gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one

¹ Rom. ii. 14.

² Rom. i. 16, 17.

³ Rom. i. 21.

⁴ Rom. ii. 8-13.

⁵ Rom. ii. 14.

⁶ Rom. i. 16.

that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek ;”¹ and since it is “ indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile [or Greek] : but glory, honour, and peace, to every man that doeth good ; to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile [or Greek] ; “ since, moreover, the Greek is indicated by the term “ Gentiles ” who do by nature the things contained in the law, and which have the work of the law written in their hearts ; it follows that such Gentiles belong to the gospel as have the law written in their hearts, to whom, on their believing, it becomes the power of God unto salvation. To what Gentiles, however, would he promise glory, and honour, and peace, in their doing good works, if living without the grace of the gospel ? Since there is no respect of persons with God,² and since it is not the hearers of the law, but the doers thereof, that are justified,³ it follows that any man of any nation, whether Jew or Greek, who shall believe, will equally have salvation under the gospel. “ For there is no difference,” as he says afterwards ; “ for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God : being justified freely by His grace.”⁴ How then could he say that any Gentile person, who was a doer of the law, was justified without the Saviour’s grace ?

CHAP. 45.—*It is not by their works, but by grace, that the doers of the law are justified ; God’s saints and God’s name hallowed in different senses.*

Now [the apostle] could not mean to contradict himself in saying, “ The doers of the law shall be justified,”⁵ as if their justification came through their works, and not through grace, when he declares that a man is justified freely by His grace without the works of the law,⁶ intending by the term “ *freely* ” nothing more than that works do not precede justification. For in another passage he expressly says, “ If by grace, then is it no more of works ; otherwise grace is no longer grace.”⁷ But the statement that “ the doers of the law shall be justified ”⁸ must be so understood, that we may know how unable men are to become doers of the law unless they

¹ Rom. i. 16.

² Rom. ii. 11.

³ Rom. ii. 13.

⁴ Rom. iii. 22-24.

⁵ Rom. ii. 13.

⁶ Rom. iii. 24, 28.

⁷ Rom. xi. 6.

⁸ Rom. ii. 13.

be justified, so that justification does not subsequently accrue to them as doers of the law, but precedes them in that character. For what else does the phrase "being justified" signify than "being made righteous,"—by Him, of course, who justifies the ungodly man, that he may become a godly one instead? If we were to express a certain fact by saying, The men will be liberated, the phrase would of course be understood as asserting that the liberation would accrue to those who were men already; but if we were to say, The men will be created, we should certainly not be understood as asserting that the creation would happen to those who were already in existence, but that they became men by the creation itself. If in like manner it were said, The doers of the law shall be honoured, we should only interpret the statement correctly if we supposed that the honour was to accrue to those who were already doers of the law. When, however, the allegation is, "The doers of the law shall be justified," what else does it mean than that the just shall be justified? for of course the doers of the law are just persons. And thus it amounts to the same thing as if it were said, The doers of the law shall be created,—not those who were so already, but that they may become such; that the Jews who were hearers of the law might hereby understand that they wanted the grace of the Justifier, in order to become its doers also. Or else the term "They shall be justified" is used in the sense of, They shall be deemed, or reckoned as just, as it is predicated of a certain man in the Gospel, "He, willing to justify himself,"¹—meaning that he wished to be thought and accounted just. Accordingly, we attach one meaning to the statement, God sanctifies His saints, and another to the words, "Hallowed [or sanctified] be Thy name;"² for in the former case we suppose the words to mean that He makes those to be saints who were not saints before, and in the latter, that the prayer would have that which is always holy and sanctified in itself be also regarded as holy by men,—in a word, be feared with a hallowed awe.

CHAP. 46.—*How the passage of the apostle agrees with that of the prophet.*

Since therefore the apostle, when he mentioned that the

¹ Luke x. 29.

² Matt. vi. 9.

Gentiles do by nature the things contained in the law, and have the work of the law written in their hearts,¹ intended those amongst them to be understood who believed in Christ,—since they come to the faith in a different way from the Jews, who have the law before faith,—there is no good reason why we should endeavour to distinguish them from those to whom the Lord by the prophet promises the new covenant, telling them that He will write His laws in their hearts,² inasmuch as they too, by the grafting which he says had been made of the wild olive, actually belong to the self-same olive-tree,³—in other words, to the same people of God. There is therefore a good agreement of this passage of the apostle with the words of the prophet; so that belonging to the new covenant or testament means having the law of God not written on tables, but on the heart,—in other words, embracing the righteousness of the law with one's innermost affection, where by that love faith works.⁴ “Because it is by faith that God justifies the Gentiles;” and the Scripture foreseeing this, preached the gospel before to Abraham, saying, “In thy seed shall all nations be blessed,”⁵ that by this grace of the promise the wild olive might be grafted into the good olive, and believing Gentiles might become children of Abraham, “in Abraham's seed, which is Christ,”⁶—following the faith of him who, without receiving the law written on tables, and not yet possessing even circumcision, “believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.”⁷ Now it must be some such thing as this which the apostle attributed to Gentiles of this character,—how that “they have the work of the law written in their hearts;”⁸ like the description which he makes to the Corinthians: “[Written] not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.”⁹ For thus do they become of the house of Israel, when their uncircumcision is accounted circumcision, by the fact that they exhibit not the righteousness of the law by the cutting of the flesh, but keep it by the charity of the heart. “If,” says he, “the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be

¹ Rom. ii. 14, 15.² Jer. xxxii. 32.³ Rom. xi. 24.⁴ Gal. v. 6.⁵ Gal. iii. 8; Gen. xxii. 18.⁶ Gal. iii. 16.⁷ Gen. xv. 6; Rom. iv. 2.⁸ Rom. ii. 15.⁹ 2 Cor. iii. 3.

counted for circumcision?"¹ Now because they are in the house of the true Israel, in which is no guile,² they become partakers of the new covenant or testament, since God puts His laws into their mind, and writes them in their hearts with His own finger, the Holy Ghost, by whom is shed abroad in them the love³ which is "the fulfilling of the law."⁴

CHAP. 47. [XXVII.]—*The law "being done by nature" means, done by nature as repaired by grace.*

Nor ought it to disturb us that the apostle described them as doing that which is contained in the law "*by nature*,"—not by the Spirit of God, not by faith, not by grace; for it is the Spirit of grace that does it, in order to restore in us the image of God, in which we were naturally created.⁵ All sin, indeed, is contrary to nature, and it is grace that heals it,—in relation to which the prayer is offered to God, "Be merciful unto me: heal my soul; for I have sinned against Thee."⁶ Therefore it is by nature that men do the things which are contained in the law;⁷ for they who do not, fail to do so by reason of their sinful defect. In consequence of this sinfulness, the law of God is erased out of their hearts; whence it follows that, when once the sin is healed, and [the law] is written in the heart, the prescriptions of the law are done "*by nature*,"—not that by nature grace is denied, but rather by grace nature is repaired. For "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;"⁸ wherefore "there is no difference: they all come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His grace."⁹ By this grace there is written on the renewed inner man that righteousness which sin had blotted out; and this mercy comes upon the human race through our Lord Jesus Christ. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus."¹⁰

¹ Rom. ii. 26.

² See John i. 47.

³ Rom. v. 5.

⁴ Rom. xiii. 10.

⁵ Gen. i. 27.

⁶ Ps. xli. 4.

⁷ Rom. ii. 14.

⁸ Rom. v. 12.

⁹ Rom. iii. 22-24.

¹⁰ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

CHAP. 48.—*Even if the apostle is understood to speak of unbelieving Gentiles, the difference which has been asserted of the new testament is not taken away; the image of God is not wholly blotted out in these unbelievers; venial sins.*

According to some, however, they who do by nature the things contained in the law must not be regarded as yet in the number of those whom Christ's grace justifies, but rather as among those whose actions (although they are those of ungodly men, who do not truly and rightly worship the true God) we not only cannot blame, but actually praise, and with good reason, and rightly too, since they have been done—so far as we read, or know, or hear—according to the rule of righteousness; though at the same time, were we to discuss the question with what motive they are done, they would hardly be found to be such as deserve the praise and defence which are due to righteous conduct. [XXVIII.] Still, [in estimating these actions, we must not lose sight of the fact] that God's image has not been so completely erased in the soul of man by the stain of earthly affections, as to have left remaining there no merest lineaments of it, whence it might be fairly said that man, even in his very ungodliness of life, did, or could appreciate, some things contained in the law. If, then, this is what is meant by the statement [of the apostle,] that "the Gentiles, which have not the law" (that is, the law of God), "do by nature the things contained in the law,"¹ and because men of this character "are a law to themselves," and "show the work of the law written in their hearts,"—that is to say, because what was impressed on their hearts when they were created in the image of God has not been wholly blotted out,—even in this view of the subject, that wide difference will not be disturbed, which separates the new covenant or testament from the old, and which lies in the fact that by the new covenant the law of God is written in the hearts of believers, whereas in the old it was inscribed on tables of stone. This writing in the heart, indeed, is effected by renovation, although it had not been completely blotted out by the old unrenewed nature. For just as the very image of God is renewed in the mind of believers by the

¹ Rom. ii. 14.

new testament, which impiety had not quite abolished (for there had remained undoubtedly that faculty which cannot be anything else than man's rational soul), so also the law of God, which had not been wholly blotted out there by unrighteousness, is certainly written thereon, being renewed by grace. Now in the Jews the law which was written on tables could not effect this new inscription (which in a word is justification), but only transgression; for they too were men, and there was inherent in them that power of nature, which enables the rational soul both to perceive and do anything that pertains to the law. But the godliness which is to transfer [the soul] happy and immortal to another life has "a spotless law, converting souls,"¹ so that by the light thereof they may be renewed, and that be accomplished in them which is written, "There has been manifested over us, O Lord, the light of Thy countenance."² Turned away from which, they have deserved to fall into decay, whilst they are incapable of renovation except by the grace of Christ,—in other words, without the intercession of the Mediator; there being "one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all."³ Should they be strangers to His grace of whom we are treating, and who (after the manner of which we have spoken with sufficient fulness already) "do by nature the things contained in the law,"⁴ of what use will be their "excusing thoughts" to them "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men,"⁵ unless it be perhaps to procure for them a milder punishment? For as, on the one hand, there are certain venial sins which do not hinder the righteous man from the attainment of eternal life, and which are unavoidable in this life, so, on the other hand, there are some good works which are of no avail to an ungodly man towards the attainment of everlasting life, although it would be very difficult to find the life of any very bad man whatever entirely without them. But inasmuch as in the kingdom of God the saints differ in glory as one star does from another,⁶ so likewise, in the condemnation of everlasting punishment, it will be more tolerable for Sodom

¹ Ps. xix. 7.² Ps. iv. 6.³ 1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.⁴ Rom. ii. 14.⁵ Rom. ii. 15, 16.⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 41.

than for that other city ;¹ whilst some men will be twofold more the children of hell than others.² Thus in the judgment of God not even this fact will be without its influence,—that one man will have sinned more, or sinned less, than another, even when both are involved in the condemnation of the same ungodliness.

CHAP. 49.—*The grace promised by the prophet for the new covenant.*

What indeed could the apostle have meant to imply by the fact that, after checking the boasting of the Jews, by telling them that “not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified,”³ he immediately afterwards speaks of them “which, having not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law,”⁴ if in this description not they are to be understood who belong to the Mediator’s grace, but rather they who, while not worshipping the true God with true godliness, do yet exhibit some good works in the general course of their ungodly lives? Or perhaps the apostle deemed it probable (from the very fact that he had previously said that “with God there is no respect of persons,”⁵ and that he afterwards said that “God is not the God of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles”⁶) that even those scanty little works of the law, which are suggested by nature, were only discovered in those, who received not the law, by the remains of the image of God, which He does not disdain when they believe in Him, with whom there is no respect of persons. But whichever of these views is accepted, it is evident that the grace of God was promised to the new testament or covenant even by the prophet, and that this grace was definitively announced to take this shape,—God’s laws were to be written in men’s hearts; and they were to arrive at such a knowledge of God, that men were not severally and solitarily to teach their neighbours and brothers, saying, Know the Lord; for all were to know Him, from the least to the greatest of them.⁷ This is the gift of the Holy Ghost, by which love is shed abroad in our hearts,⁸—not, indeed, any love of a vague, indefinite character, but God’s love, “out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and

¹ Luke x. 12.

² Matt. xxiii. 15.

³ Rom. ii. 13.

⁴ Rom. ii. 14.

⁵ Rom. ii. 11.

⁶ Rom. iii. 29.

⁷ Jer. xxxi. 33, 34.

⁸ Rom. v. 5.

an unfeigned faith,"¹ by means of which the just man, while living in this pilgrim state, is led on, after the stages of "the glass," and "the enigma," and "the partial knowledge," to the actual vision, that he may see face to face, and know even as he is known himself.² For one thing has he required of the Lord, and that he still seeks after, that he may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of his life, in order to behold the fair beauty of the Lord.³

CHAP. 50. [XXIX.]—*Righteousness is the gift of God.*

Let no man therefore boast of that which he seems to possess, as if he had not received it;⁴ nor let him think that he has received it merely because the letter of the law has been externally exhibited to him to read, and sounded in his ear for him to hear it. For "if righteousness came by the law, then Christ died in vain."⁵ Seeing, however, that He has not died in vain, and has ascended up on high, and has led captivity captive, and has given gifts to men,⁶ it follows that whosoever possesses gifts, has them from that source. If, indeed, any man denies that he has received them thus, he either does not possess them, or is in great danger of being deprived of what he has.⁷ "For it is one God which justifies the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith;"⁸ in which clauses there is no real difference in the sense, as if the phrase "*by faith*" meant one thing, and "*through faith*" another, but only a variety of expression. For in one passage, when speaking of the Gentiles,—that is, of the uncircumcision,—he says, "The Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen *by faith*"⁹ [*ex fide, ἐκ πίστεως*];" again, in another, when speaking of the circumcision, to which he himself belonged, he says, "We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but *through faith*" [*per fidem, διὰ πίστεως*] in Jesus Christ, even we believed in Jesus Christ."¹⁰ Observe, he says that the uncircumcision are justified by faith,

¹ 1 Tim. i. 5.

² 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

³ Ps. xxvii. 4.

⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

⁵ Gal. ii. 21.

⁶ Ps. lxxviii. 18; Eph. iv. 8.

⁷ Luke viii. 18, xix. 26.

⁸ Rom. iii. 30.

⁹ Gal. iii. 8.

¹⁰ Gal. ii. 15, 16.

and the circumcision through faith, if, indeed, the circumcision keep the righteousness of faith. For "the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of [or 'by'] faith,"¹ by obtaining it of God, not by assuming it of themselves. "But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness. And why? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law"²—in other words, working it out as it were by themselves, not believing that it is God who works within them. "For it is God which worketh in us both to will and to do of His own good pleasure."³ And hereby "they stumbled at the stumbling-stone."⁴ For what he asserted about their "not seeking [righteousness] by faith, but as it were by the works of the law,"⁵ he most clearly explained in the following words: "They, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."⁶ Then are we still in doubt what are those works of the law by which a man is not justified, if he believes them to be his own works, as it were, without the help and gift of God, which is "by the faith of Jesus Christ?" Do we suppose that they are circumcision and the other like ordinances, because some such things in other passages are read concerning these sacramental rites? In this place, however, it is certainly not circumcision which they wanted to establish as their own righteousness, because God established this by prescribing it Himself. Nor is it possible for us to understand the statement of those works concerning which the Lord says to them, "Ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition,"⁷ because, as the apostle says, Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness."⁸ He did not say, Which followed after their own traditions, framing them and relying on them. This then is solely the distinction in their case, that the very precept,

¹ Rom. ix. 30.² Rom. ix. 31, 32.³ Phil. ii. 13.⁴ Rom. ix. 32.⁵ Rom. ix. 32.⁶ Rom. x. 3, 4.⁷ Mark vii. 9.⁸ Rom. ix. 31.

“Thou shalt not covet,”¹ and God’s other good and holy commandments, they attributed to themselves; whereas, that man may keep them, God must work in him through faith in Jesus Christ, who is “the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.”² That is to say, every one who is incorporated into Him and made a member of His body, is able, by His giving the increase within, to work righteousness. It is of such a man’s works that Christ Himself has said, “Without me ye can do nothing.”³

CHAP. 51.

The righteousness of the law is set forth in these terms, that whosoever achieves the same shall live in it; and the purpose which such a proposition has in view is, that whenever a man has discovered his own weakness, he may by faith conciliate the grace of the Justifier, and thus, arriving at [the righteousness of the law] not by his own strength, nor by the letter of the law (which becomes impracticable and unavailing to him), may reduce it to action, and live in it. Now the work by which a man shall live, if he accomplish it, is only effected by one who is justified. His justification, however, is obtained by faith; and concerning faith it is written, “Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring down Christ therefrom;) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart: that is (says he), the word of faith which we preach; That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.”⁴ As far as he is saved, so far is he righteous. For by this faith we believe that God will raise even us from the dead,—even now in the spirit, that we may in this present world live soberly, righteously, and godly in the renewal of His grace; and by and by in our flesh, which shall rise again to an undying condition. This indeed is the gift of the Spirit, who introduces this immortality by a resurrection which is suitable in itself,—in a word, by our justification. “For we are buried with Christ by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised

¹ Ex. xx. 17.² Rom. x. 4.³ John xv. 5.⁴ Rom. x. 6-9.

up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.”¹ By faith, therefore, in Jesus Christ we obtain salvation,—both so far as it is begun within us in reality, and is expected to be accomplished for us hereafter in hope; “for whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.”² “How abundant,” says the Psalmist, “is the multitude of Thy goodness, O Lord, which Thou hast laid up for them that fear Thee, and hast perfected for them that hope in Thee!”³ By the law we fear God; by faith we hope in God: but from those who are afraid of punishment grace is hidden. Now the soul which labours under this fear, from not having conquered its evil concupiscence, and from which this fear, like a harsh master, has not departed, should flee for refuge to the mercy of God in faith, that He may impart to it what He commands, and may, by infusing into it the sweetness of His grace through His Holy Spirit, cause the soul to take greater delight in what He teaches it, than pleasure in what opposes His instruction. In this manner it is that the abundance of God’s goodness,—that is to say, the law of faith,—the love which is impressed and shed abroad in men’s hearts, is perfected in them that hope in Him, that good works may be wrought by the soul, when it is healed not by the fear of punishment, but by the love of righteousness.

CHAP. 52. [XXX.]

Do we then by grace make void man’s freedom of will? God forbid! We rather establish that faculty. For as the law is not weakened or cancelled by faith, neither is free will by grace.⁴ Indeed, the law is only fulfilled by a free exercise of the will; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. By faith comes the acquisition of grace to resist sin; by grace the soul procures healing from the disease of sin; by the health of the soul liberty is given to the will; from this freedom of the will arises the love of righteousness, and from this love of holiness proceeds the accomplishment of the law. Accordingly, as the law is not made void, but is established through faith, since faith procures the grace whereby the

¹ Rom. vi. 4.² Rom. x. 13; Joel ii. 32.³ Ps. xxxi. 19.⁴ Rom. iii. 31.

law is fulfilled, so the freedom of the will is not made void through grace, but rather is thereby established, inasmuch as grace gives a healthy condition to a man's desire, whereby he is enabled to love righteousness frankly and fully. Now all the stages which I have here connected together in their successive links, have each their proper voices in the sacred Scriptures. The law says: "Thou shalt not covet."¹ Faith says: "Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee."² Grace says: "Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee."³ The healed condition says: "O Lord my God, I cried unto Thee, and Thou hast healed me."⁴ The liberty of the will says: "I will freely sacrifice unto Thee."⁵ The love of righteousness says: "Transgressors told me pleasant tales, but not according to Thy law, O Lord."⁶ How is it then that miserable men dare to be proud, either of their free will, before they have liberty, or of their own strength, if they have been liberated? [Talk of free will!] They do not observe that in the very mention of free will there is of course the sound of liberty. But "where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."⁷ Since, however, they are the servants of sin, why do they boast of their free will? "For by what a man is overcome, by the same is he brought in bondage."⁸ But if they have been liberated from that bondage, why do they vaunt themselves as if it were by their own doing? Why boast, as if they had not received [the gift?] Or is their free condition of such sort that they do not choose to have Him for their Lord who says to them: "Without me ye can do nothing;"⁹ and "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed?"¹⁰

CHAP. 53. [XXXI.]—*Is faith in our own power? possessing will; possessing power; how one is said to act against his will.*

Some one will ask whether the faith itself lies in our own power, in which seems to be the beginning either of salvation, or of that series leading to salvation which I have just mentioned. Now we shall see this question more easily, if we first examine with some care what "our own power" means. There

¹ Ex. xx. 17.

² Ps. xli. 4.

³ John v. 14.

⁴ Ps. xxx. 2.

⁵ Ps. liv. 6.

⁶ Ps. cxix. 85 (Septuagint).

⁷ 2 Cor. iii. 17.

⁸ 2 Pet. ii. 19.

⁹ John xv. 5.

¹⁰ John viii. 36.

are then two faculties,—the exercise of will and the exercise of power,—and not every one that has the will has therefore the power also, nor has every one that possesses the power got the will in immediate control; for as we sometimes will what we cannot do, so also we sometimes can do what we do not will. If we turn over¹ in our examination merely the words themselves with sufficient care, we shall detect, in the very ring of the terms, the derivation of *the wish* or *will*² from the existence of the wishing faculty,³ and of *the ability* or *power*⁴ from the fact of our being able⁵ to do this or that. Therefore, even as the man who wishes has volition or will, so also the man who can do so and so possesses ability or power; but in order that a thing may be done with power, the will must be present. For no man is usually said to do a thing with power or mastery if he did it unwillingly. Although, at the same time, if we go into the thing accurately, even that which a man is forced to do against his will, he does, if he really accomplishes the thing, with his will; only he is said to be an unwilling agent, or to act against his will in that particular thing, because he would prefer doing some other thing. He is compelled, indeed, by some unfortunate influence, to do what he does under the compulsion, wishing all the while to escape it or to remove it out of his way. Now if his will be such that he prefers not doing this to not suffering that, then undoubtedly he resists the compelling influence, and does it not. And accordingly, if he does it, it is not with a full free will, although at the same time it is not without a will that he does it; and inasmuch as the will is closely followed by its effect, we cannot say that he lacked the power, as he did it. If, indeed, he had the wish to do it, yielding to compulsion, but lacked the power, although we allowed that a coerced will was present to the agent, we should yet say that the power was absent. But when his reason for not doing the thing was because he was unwilling, then of course the power was present although the will was absent, since he did it not, by his resistance to the compelling influence. Hence it is that even they who compel, or they who persuade, to an action, are accustomed to say, Why don't you

¹ Evolutis.² Voluntas.³ Velle.⁴ Potestas.⁵ Posse.

do what you have it in your power to do, in order to get rid of this evil [coercion?] While they who are utterly powerless to do what they are compelled to do, on the ground that they are supposed to be able, usually answer that question by excusing themselves, and say, I would do it if it were in my power. What then do we want more, since we call that power when to the will is added at once the faculty of doing anything? Accordingly, every one is said to have that in his power which he does if he likes, and does not if he dislikes it.

CHAP. 54.—*Whether faith be in a man's own power; faith twofold; faith in our own power, but only when a man believes voluntarily; all power, but not will, is from God.*

Attend now to the point which we have laid down for discussion: whether faith be in our own power? We now speak of that faith which we employ when we believe anything, not that which we impart when we make a promise; for this [fidelity] also is called *faith*. We use the word in one sense when we say, "He put no faith in me," and in another sense when we say, "He did not keep faith with me." The one phrase means, "He did not believe what I said;" the other, "He did not do what he promised." According to the faith by which we believe, we are faithful to God; but according to that whereby a thing is realized which is promised, God Himself even is faithful to us; for so much does the apostle declare, "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able."¹ Well, now, this is the faith about which we inquire, Whether it be in our power? even the faith by which we believe God, or believe in God. For of this it is written, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness."² And again, "To him that believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."³ Consider now whether anybody believes, if he be unwilling; or whether he believes not, if he be desirous to do so. Such a position, indeed, is absurd; for what is believing but agreeing to the truth of what is asserted? This consent, however, proves the possession of will: faith, therefore, is in our own power. But, as

¹ 1 Cor. x. 13.

² Rom. iv. 3; comp. Gen. xv. 6.

³ Rom. iv. 5.

the apostle says: "There is no power but comes from God,"¹ what reason then is there why it may not be said to us even of that: "What hast thou which thou hast not received?"² for it is God who gave us even to believe. Nowhere, however, in Holy Scripture do we find such an assertion as, There is no will or volition but comes from God. And rightly is it not so written, because it is not true. Otherwise God would be the Author of sins (which Heaven forbid!), if there were no will or volition except what comes from Him; inasmuch as a depraved will alone is already a sin, even if the effect be wanting,—in other words, if it has not the power of acting. But when the depraved will receives power to accomplish its intention, this proceeds from the judgment of God, with whom there is no unrighteousness.³ He indeed inflicts His punishment even after such a manner as this; nor is His chastisement unjust, because it is secret. The ungodly man, however, is not aware that he is being punished, except when he unwillingly discovers by a manifest penalty how much evil he has willingly committed. This is just what the apostle remarks of certain men: "God hath given them up to the evil desires of their own hearts, . . . to do those things that are not convenient."⁴ Accordingly, the Lord also said to Pilate: "Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above."⁵ But still, when the power is given, it does not follow that a necessity is imposed. Therefore, although David had acquired a power to kill Saul, he preferred sparing to striking him.⁶ Whence we understand that bad men receive power in their own depraved will for condemnation, while good men receive the power of a good will to test their piety.

CHAP. 55. [XXXII.]—*What faith is laudable.*

Since faith, then, is in our power, inasmuch as every one believes when he likes; and since, when he believes, he willingly believes; our next inquiry, which we must conduct with care, is, What faith it is which the apostle commends with so much earnestness? For indiscriminate faith, [or

¹ Rom. xiii. 1.

² 1 Cor. iv. 7.

³ Rom. ix. 14.

⁴ Rom. i. 24, 28.

⁵ John xix. 11.

⁶ 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, and xxvi. 9.

credulity,] is not a good thing. Accordingly we find this caution: "Brethren, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God."¹ Nor must the clause in commendation of charity, that it "believeth all things,"² be so understood as derogating from the charity of any particular person, if he refuses at once to believe what he hears. For the same charity admonishes us that we ought not readily to believe anything evil about a brother; and when anything of the kind is said of him, it judges it to be more suitable to its own character not to believe the aspersion. Lastly, the same charity, "which believeth all things," does not believe every spirit. Accordingly [this distinction arises:] charity believes all things, but it believes *in* God. Observe, it is not said, Believes *in* all things. It cannot therefore be doubted that the faith which is commended by the apostle is the faith whereby we believe in God.³

CHAP. 56.—*The faith of those who are under the law different from the faith of others; slavish fear; faith works by love, not by fear.*

But there is yet another distinction to be observed, since they who are under the law both attempt to work righteousness through fear of punishment, and fail to do God's righteousness, because this is accomplished solely by the charity to which only what is lawful is pleasing, and never by the fear which is forced to regard in its work the thing which is lawful, although at the same time it has something else in its will which would prefer the unlawful object of its desire being allowed it, if it were only possible. These persons also believe in God; for if they had no faith in Him at all, neither would they of course have any dread of the penalty of His law. This, however, is not the faith which the apostle commends. He says: "Ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father."⁴ The fear, then, of which we speak is the fear of slaves; and therefore, even though there be in it a belief in the Lord, yet righteousness is not loved by it, but condemnation is feared. God's children, however, exclaim, "Abba, Father,"—one of

¹ 1 John iv. 1.

² 1 Cor. xiii. 7.

³ Rom. iv. 3 (πιστιναι τῷ Θεῷ).

⁴ Rom. viii. 15.

which words they of the circumcision utter ; the other, they of the uncircumcision,—the Jew first, and then the Greek.¹ There is “one God, which justifieth the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith.”² When indeed they utter this call, they want something ; and what do they want, but that which they hunger and thirst after ? And what else is this but that which is said of them, “Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled ?”³ Let, then, those who are under the law pass over to this position, and become sons instead of slaves ; and yet not so as to cease to be servants, but so as, while they are sons, still to serve their Lord and Father in a loving and generous spirit. For even this great gift have they received ; for the Only-begotten “gave them power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name ;”⁴ and He advised them to ask, to seek, and to knock, in order to receive, to find, and to have the gate opened to them,⁵ adding by way of rebuke, the words : “If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him ?”⁶ When, therefore, that strength of sin, the law,⁷ inflamed the sting of death, even sin, to take occasion by the commandment, and work all manner of concupiscence in them,⁸ of whom were they to ask for the gift of continence, but of Him who knows how to give good gifts to His children ? Perhaps, however, a man, in his folly, is unaware that no one can be continent except God give him the gift. To know this, indeed, he requires Wisdom herself.⁹ Why, then, does the man not listen to the Spirit of his Father, speaking through Christ’s apostle, or even Christ Himself, who says in His gospel, “Seek and ye shall find ;”¹⁰ and who also says to us, speaking by His apostle : “If any one of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given to him. Let him, however, ask in faith, nothing wavering ?”¹¹ This is the faith by which the just man lives ;¹² this is the faith whereby he believes on Him

¹ Rom. ii. 9.² Rom. iii. 30.³ Matt. v. 6.⁴ John i. 12.⁵ See Matt. vii. 7.⁶ Matt. vii. 11.⁷ 1 Cor. xv. 56.⁸ Rom. vii. 8.⁹ Wisd. viii. 21.¹⁰ Matt. vii. 7.¹¹ Jas. i. 5, 6.¹² Rom. i. 17.

who justifies the ungodly;¹ this is the faith through which boasting is excluded,² either by the retirement of that with which we become self-inflated, or by the excitement of that with which we glory in the Lord. This, again, is the faith by which we procure that copious gift of the Spirit, of which it is said: "We indeed through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith."³ But this admits of the further question, Whether he meant by "the hope of righteousness" that by which righteousness hopes, or that whereby righteousness is itself hoped for? For the just man, who lives by faith, hopes undoubtedly for eternal life; and the faith likewise, which hungers and thirsts for righteousness, makes progress therein by the renewal of the inward man day by day,⁴ and hopes to be satiated therewith in that eternal life, where shall be realized that which is said by the Psalmist of God: "Who satisfieth thy desire with good things."⁵ This, moreover, is the faith whereby they are saved to whom it is said: "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."⁶ This, in short, is the faith which works not by fear, but by love;⁷ not by dreading punishment, but by loving righteousness. Whence, therefore, arises this love,—that is to say, this charity,—by which faith works, if not from the source whence faith itself obtained it? For it would not be within us, to what extent soever it is in us, if it were not diffused in our hearts by the Holy Ghost who is given to us.⁸ Now "*the love of God*" is said to be shed abroad in our hearts, not because He loves us, but because He makes us lovers of Himself; just as "*the righteousness of God*"⁹ is used in the sense of our being made righteous by His gift; and "*the salvation of the Lord*,"¹⁰ in that we are saved by Him; and "*the faith of Jesus Christ*,"¹¹ because He makes us believers in Him. This is that righteousness of God, which He not

¹ Rom. iv. 5.² Rom. iii. 27.³ Gal. v. 5.⁴ 2 Cor. iv. 16.⁵ Ps. ciii. 5 (Sept.).⁶ Eph. ii. 8-10.⁷ Gal. v. 6.⁸ Rom. v. 5.⁹ Rom. iii. 21.¹⁰ Ps. iii. 8.¹¹ Gal. ii. 16.

only teaches us by the precept of His law, but also bestows upon us by the gift of His Spirit.

CHAP. 57. [XXXIII.]—*Whence comes the will to believe?*

But it remains for us briefly to inquire, Whether the will with which we believe be itself the gift of God, or whether it be the production of that freedom of will which is naturally implanted in us? If we say that it is not the gift of God, we must then incur the fear of supposing that we have discovered some answer to the apostle's reproachful appeal: "What hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?"¹—even some such an answer as this: See, we have the will to believe, which we did not receive. See in what we glory,—even in the fact that we did not receive it! If, however, we were to say that this kind of will is nothing but the gift of God, we should then have to fear lest unbelieving ungodly men might not unreasonably seem to have some fair ground for their unbelief, in the fact that God has refused to give them this will. Now the apostle's statement: "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His own good pleasure,"² refers to that grace which faith secures, in order that good works may be within the reach of man,—even the good works which faith achieves through the love which is shed abroad in the heart by the Holy Ghost which is given to us. If we believe that we may obtain this grace (and of course believe with our will), then the question arises, whence we have this will?—if from nature, why is it not at everybody's command, since the same God made all men? if from God's gift, then again, why is not the gift open to all, since "He will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth?"³

CHAP. 58.—*The free will of man is an intermediate power; the will of God is invincible for ever; good works the result of grace.*

Let us then, first of all, lay down this proposition, and see whether it satisfies the question before us, that our freedom of will is naturally assigned by the Creator to our rational soul, and that it is an intermediate power, which is able either to incline towards faith, or to turn towards unbelief. Consequently a man cannot be said to have even that will with

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

² Phil. ii. 13.

³ 1 Tim. ii. 4.

which he believes in God, without having received it, since at the call of God it rises out of that free will which he received naturally when he was created. God no doubt wishes all men to be saved; but yet not so as to take away from them their liberty of will, for the good or the evil use of which they may be most righteously judged. This being the case, unbelievers indeed do contrary to the will of God when they do not believe His gospel; nevertheless they do not overcome His will, but they rob their own selves of the great, nay, the very greatest, good, and implicate themselves in penalties of misery, destined to experience in their punishment the power of Him whose mercy they despised in His gifts. Thus God's will is for ever invincible; but it would be vanquished, unless it could devise what to do with such as despised it, or if these despisers could in any way escape from the retribution which He has appointed for such as they. Suppose a master, for example, who should say to his servants, I wish you to labour in my vineyard, and, after your work is done, to feast and take your rest; but who, at the same time, should require any who refused to work to grind in the mill ever after. Whoever neglected such a command would evidently act contrary to the master's will; but he would do more than that,—he would vanquish that will, if he also despised and refused the mill. This, however, cannot possibly happen under the government of God. Whence it is written, "God hath spoken once,"—that is, irrevocably,—although the passage may refer to His one only Son. He then adds what it is which He had irrevocably uttered, saying: "Twice have I heard this, that power belongeth unto God. Also unto Thee, O Lord, doth mercy belong: because Thou wilt render to every man according to his work."¹ He therefore will be guilty enough to deserve condemnation under God's mighty hand, who shall think too contemptuously of His mercy to believe in Him. But whosoever shall put his trust in Him, and yield himself up to Him, for the forgiveness of all his sins, for the cure of all his corruption, and for the kindling and illumination of his soul by His warmth and light, shall find good works spring from His grace; and by them² he shall be even

¹ Ps. lxii. 11, 12.

² Ex quibus.

in his body redeemed from the corruption of death, and be crowned, and be satisfied with blessings,—not temporal, but eternal,—above what we can ask or understand.

CHAP. 59.—*Mercy and pity in the judgment of God.*

This is the order observed in the psalm, where it is said: “Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all His recompenses; who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercy; who satisfieth thy desire with good things.”¹ And lest by any chance these great blessings should be despaired of under the corruption and deformity of our old mortal condition, the Psalmist at once says, “Thy youth shall be renewed like the eagle’s;”² as much as to say, All that you have heard belongs to the renewed man and to the new covenant. Now let us consider together briefly these very [statements of the psalm,] and with delight examine its eulogy on the mercy, that is, the grace of God. “Bless the Lord, O my soul,” he says, “and forget not all His recompenses.” Observe, he does not say blessings, but *recompenses*;³ because He recompenses evil with good. “Who forgiveth all thine iniquities:” this is done in the sacrament of baptism. “Who healeth all thy diseases:” this is effected by the believer in the present life, while the flesh so lusts against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, that we cannot do the things we would;⁴ whilst also another law in our members wars against the law of our mind;⁵ whilst to will is present indeed to us, but not how to perform that which is good.⁶ These are the diseases of a man’s old nature, which, however, if we only advance with persevering purpose, are healed by the growth of the new nature day by day, owing to the faith which operates through love.⁷ “Who redeemeth thy life from destruction;” this will take place at the resurrection of the dead in the last day. “Who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercy;” this shall be accomplished in the day of judgment; for when the righteous King

¹ Ps. ciii. 2-5.

² Non tributiones, sed retributiones.

³ Rom. vii. 23.

⁴ Rom. vii. 18.

² Ps. ciii. 5.

⁴ Gal. v. 17.

⁷ Gal. v. 6.

shall sit upon His throne to render to every man according to his works, who shall be then able to boast of having a pure heart? or who shall glory of being clean from sin? It was therefore necessary to mention God's loving-kindness and tender mercy as present there, where one might expect debts to be demanded and deserts recompensed so strictly as to leave no room for mercy. Well then does he crown [the edifice of grace] with mercy and pity; but even here regard is had to works. For the man shall be separately placed on the right hand for it to be said to him, "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat."¹ There will, however, be also "judgment without mercy;" but it will be for him "that hath not showed mercy."² But "blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy"³ of God. Then, as soon as those on the left hand shall have gone into eternal fire, and the righteous into everlasting life,⁴ [these shall experience that of which] He says: "This is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent."⁵ And with this knowledge, this vision, this contemplation, shall the desire of their soul be satisfied; for it shall be enough for it to have this and nothing else,—there being nothing more for it to desire, to aspire to, or to require. It was with a craving after this full joy that his heart glowed who said to the Lord Christ, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" and to whom the answer was returned, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."⁶ Because He is Himself the eternal life, in order that men may know, O God, that Thou art one only with Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent. If, however, he that has seen the Father has also seen the Son, then assuredly he who sees the Father and the Son sees also the Holy Spirit of the Father and the Son. So we do not impair the freedom of man's will, whilst our soul blesses the Lord and forgets not all His recompenses;⁷ nor does it, in ignorance of God's righteousness, wish to set up one of its own;⁸ but it believes in Him who justifies the ungodly,⁹ and until it arrives at the sight of its happiness, it lives by faith,

¹ Matt. xxv. 35.² Jas. ii. 13.³ Matt. v. 7.⁴ Matt. xxv. 46.⁵ John xvii. 3.⁶ John xiv. 8, 9.⁷ Ps. ciii. 2.⁸ Rom. x. 3.⁹ Rom. iv. 5.

—even that faith which works by love.¹ And this love is shed abroad in our hearts, by no sufficiency of our own will, nor by the letter of the law, but by the Holy Ghost who has been given to us.²

CHAP. 60. [XXXIV.]—*The will to believe is from God.*

Let this discussion suffice, as it satisfactorily meets the question we had to solve. Since, however, it is objected in reply, that we must be on our guard lest any man should suppose the sin would have to be imputed to God which is committed through our free will, if in the passage where it is said, “What hast thou which thou didst not receive?”³ the very will by which we believe in God is therefore reckoned as a gift of God, because it arises out of that freedom of our will which we received at our creation—then let the objector attentively observe that the will in question must not be ascribed to the divine gift, merely because it arises from our freedom of will, which was created naturally with us; for there is another reason, even because God acts upon us by the incentives of visible objects to will and to believe; He also influences us externally by evangelical exhortations; where even the commands of the law also do something, since they so far admonish a man of his infirmity, that he betakes himself to the grace that justifies by believing; He furthermore affects our minds by internal influence, in which no man has it in his own control as to what shall enter into his thoughts; it appertains, however, to his own will either to consent or to dissent. Since God, therefore, in such ways acts upon the reasonable soul, and induces it to believe in Him (for nothing whatever can possibly trust in man’s free will, seeing that it has no persuasiveness and no call in which to believe), it surely follows that it is God who works in man the actual willingness to believe, and in all things prevents us with His mercy. To yield our consent, indeed, or to withhold it, whenever God calls, is (as I have said) the function of our own will. Now this circumstance not only does not invalidate what is said, “For what hast thou that thou didst not receive?”⁴ but it really confirms it. For the

¹ Gal. v. 6.

² Rom. v. 5.

³ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

⁴ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

soul cannot receive and possess these gifts, which are here referred to, except by yielding its own consent. So that whatever it possesses, and whatever it receives, is from God and belongs to God; and yet the act of receiving and having belongs, of course, to the receiver and the possessor. Now, should any man be for constraining us to examine into that profound fact of our moral nature, why this person is so far advised as to be persuaded, and that person is not, there are only two thoughts occurring to me, which I should like to advance as my answer: "O the depth of the riches!"¹ and "Is there unrighteousness with God?"² If the man is displeased with such an answer, he must seek more learned disputants. Let him beware, however, lest he find in them presumptuous wranglers!

[CHAP. 61. [XXXV.]—*Conclusion of the work.*

Let us at last bring our book to an end. I hardly know whether we have accomplished our purpose at all by our great prolixity. It is not in respect of you, [my Marcellinus,] that I have this misgiving, for I know your faith; but with reference to the minds of those for whose sake you wished me to write. It is not so much in opposition to my opinion, but (to speak mildly, and not to mention the doctrine of Him who spoke in His apostles) certainly against not only the opinion of the great Apostle Paul, but also his strong, earnest, and vigilant conflict, that they prefer maintaining their own views with tenacity to listening to him, when he "beseeches them by the mercies of God," and tells them, "through the grace of God which was given to him, not to think of themselves more highly than they ought to think, but to think soberly, according as God had dealt to every man the measure of faith."³

CHAP. 62.—*He returns to the question which Marcellinus had proposed to him.*

But I beg of you to advert to the question which you proposed to me, and to what we have made out of it in the lengthy process of this discussion. You were perplexed how I could have said that it was possible for a man to be without sin, if his will were not wanting, by the help of God's

¹ Rom. xi. 33.

² Rom. ix. 14.

³ Rom. xii. 1, 3.

strength, although no man in the present life had ever lived, was living, or would live, of such perfect righteousness. Now, in the books which I formerly addressed to you, I set forth this very question. I said: "If I were asked whether it be possible for a man in this life to be without sin, I should allow the possibility, through the grace of God, and the man's own free will; for I should have no doubt that the free will itself is ascribable to God's grace,—in other words, has its place among the gifts of God,—not only as to its existence, but also in respect of its goodness; that is to say, [it is a gift of God] that it applies itself to doing the commandments of God. Thus it is that God's grace not only shows a man what he ought to do, but also gives him such assistance as secures the possibility of that being done which His grace points out to be done."¹ You seemed to think it absurd, that a thing which might happen was actually unexampled. Hence arose the subject treated of in this book; and thus did it devolve on me to show that a thing was possible although no example of it could be found. We accordingly adduced certain cases out of the gospel and of the law, at the beginning of this work,—such as the passing of a camel through the eye of a needle;² and the twelve [thousand] legions of angels, who could fight for Christ, if He pleased;³ and those nations which God said He could have exterminated at once from the face of His people,⁴—none of which possibilities were ever reduced to fact. To these instances may be added those which are referred to in the Book of Wisdom,⁵ suggesting how many are the strange torments and troubles which God was able to employ against ungodly men, by using the creature which was obedient to His beck, which, however, He did not employ. One might also allude to the supposed "mountain," which faith could remove into the sea,⁶ although no realization of such a thing anywhere took place, so far as we have ever read⁷ or heard. Now you see how thoughtless

¹ See his work preceding this, *De Peccat. Meritis*, ii. 7.

² Matt. xix. 24.

³ Matt. xxvi. 53.

⁴ Deut. xxxi. 3; comp. Judg. ii. 3.

⁵ Wisdom xvi.

⁶ Matt. xxi. 21.

⁷ Augustine, it would then seem, had not met with the statement of Eusebius,

and foolish would be the man who should say that any one of these things is impossible with God, and how opposed to the sense of Scripture would be his assertion. Many other cases of this kind may occur to anybody who reads or thinks, the possibility of which with God we cannot deny, although there may not be any example of them forthcoming.

CHAP. 63.—*An objection.*

But inasmuch as it may be said that the instances which I have been quoting are divine works, whereas to live righteously is a work that belongs to ourselves, I undertook to show that even this too is a divine work. This I have done in the present book, with perhaps a fuller statement than is necessary, although I seem to myself to have said too little against the opponents of the grace of God. And I am never so much delighted in my treatment of a subject as when Scripture comes most copiously to my aid; and when the question to be discussed requires that "he that glorieth should glory in the Lord;"¹ and that we should in all things lift up our hearts and give thanks to the Lord our God, from whom, "as the Father of lights, every good and every perfect gift cometh down."² Now if a gift is not God's gift, on the ground of its being wrought by us, or because we act by His gift, then it is not a work of God that "a mountain should be removed into the sea," inasmuch as, according to the Lord's statement, it is through faith—men's faith—that this is possible. Moreover, He attributes the deed to their actual operation: "If ye have faith in yourselves as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done, and nothing shall be impossible to you."³ Observe how He said "to you," not to me or to the Father; and yet it is certain that no man does such a thing without God's gift and operation. See how unexampled among men is an instance of

as translated by Rufinus (*Hist.* vii. 24), to the effect that Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea, in Pontus, once performed the miracle of removing a mountain or rock from its place; which Bede also mentions, *Comment.* on Mark xi., Book iii.

¹ 2 Cor. x. 17.

² Jas. i. 17.

³ Compare Matt. xvii. 20, Mark xi. 23, Luke xvii. 6.

perfect righteousness ; but yet it is not impossible. For it might be achieved if there were only applied as much of a favourable will as suffices for so great a work. Now there *would* accrue this just amount of will, if there were not hidden from us any of those qualities and conditions which pertain to righteousness ; and if these pleasantly affected our mind to such a degree, that whatever hindrance of pleasure or pain might else occur, this delight in holiness prevailed over every rival affection. Now the fact that this is not realized, is not owing to any intrinsic impossibility, but to God's judicial act. For who can be ignorant of the truth, that it is not in a man's power as to what he should know ; nor does it follow that what he has discovered to be a desirable object is actually desired, unless he also feel a delight in that object, commensurate with its claims on his affection ? For this is characteristic of the soul's healthy condition.

CHAP. 64. [XXXVI.]—*How the commandment to love is fulfilled ; sins of ignorance.*

But somebody will perhaps think that we want nothing for helping us to the knowledge of righteousness, since the Lord, when on earth He summarily and briefly expounded His word, informed us that the whole law and the prophets depend on two commandments ;¹ nor was He silent as to what these were, but declared them in the plainest words : “Thou shalt love,” said He, “the Lord thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind ;” and “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.”² What is more surely true than that, if these be fulfilled, all righteousness is fulfilled ? But the man who sets his mind on this truth must also carefully attend to another,—in how many things we all of us offend,³ while we suppose that what we do is pleasant (or, at all events, not displeasing) to God whom we love ; and afterwards, having (through His inspired word, or else by being warned in some clear and certain way) learned what is not pleasing to Him, we pray to Him that He would forgive us on our repentance. The life of man is full of examples of this. But whence comes it that we fall short of knowing what is pleasing to Him, if it be not from the circumstance

¹ Matt. xxii. 40.

² Matt. xxii. 37, 39.

³ Jas. iii. 2.

that He is to that extent unknown to us? "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face."¹ Who, however, can make so bold, on arriving far enough to say: "Then shall I know even as also I am known,"² as to think that they who shall see God will have no greater love towards Him than they have who now believe in Him? or that the one ought to be compared to the other, as if they were in very near ratio with each other? Now, if love increases just in proportion as our knowledge of its object becomes more intimate, of course we ought to believe that there is as much wanting now to the fulfilment of righteousness as there is defective in our love of it. A thing may indeed be known or believed, and yet not loved; but it is an utter impossibility that a thing can be loved which is neither known nor believed. But if the saints, in the exercise of their faith, could arrive at that great love, than which (as the Lord Himself testified) no greater can possibly be exhibited in the present life,—even to lay down their lives for the faith, or for their brethren,³—then after their pilgrimage here, in which their walk is by "faith," when they shall have reached the "sight" of that final happiness⁴ which we hope for, though as yet we see it not, and wait for in patience,⁵ [then, I say,] the very love itself shall undoubtedly be not only greater than that which we here experience, but far higher than all which we ask or think;⁶ and yet it cannot be possibly more than [we can embrace] with all our heart, and with all our soul, and with all our mind. For there remains in us nothing which can be added to the whole; since, if anything did remain, there would not be the whole. Therefore the first commandment about righteousness, which bids us love the Lord with all our heart, and soul, and mind⁷ (the next to which is, that we love our neighbour as ourselves), we shall completely fulfil in that life, when we shall see face to face.⁸ But even now this commandment is enjoined upon us, that we may be reminded what we ought by faith to require, and to what we should in our hope look forward to, and, "forget-

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.² 1 Cor. xiii. 12.³ John xv. 13.⁴ 2 Cor. v. 7.⁵ Rom. viii. 23.⁶ Eph. iii. 20.⁷ Matt. xxii. 37.⁸ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

ting the things which are behind, reach forth to the things which are before."¹ And thus, as it appears to me, that man has made a far advance, even in the present life, in the righteousness which is to be perfected hereafter, who has discovered by this very advance how very far removed he is from the completion of righteousness.

CHAP. 65.—*In what sense a sinless righteousness in this life can be asserted.*

Forasmuch, however, as an inferior righteousness may be said to be competent to this life, whereby the just man lives by faith,² although absent from the Lord; still as walking by faith, and not yet by sight,³ it may be said, even in respect of it, that it is free from sin; for it ought not to be attributed to it as a fault, that it is not as yet sufficient for so great a love to God, as is due to the final, complete, and perfect condition thereof. It is one thing to fail at present in attaining to the fulness of love, and another thing to be swayed by no lust. A man ought therefore to abstain from every unlawful desire, however much he loves God now less than it is possible to love Him when He becomes an object of sight. It is just the same in matters connected with the bodily senses: the eye can receive no pleasure from any kind of darkness, although it may be unable to look with a firm sight amidst refulgent light. Only let us see to it that we so constitute the soul of man in this corruptible body, that, although it has not yet absorbed and consumed the motions of earthly lust, it nevertheless, in that inferior righteousness to which we have referred, gives no consent to the aforesaid lust for the purpose of effecting any unlawful thing. In respect, therefore, of that perfect eternal life, the commandment is even now applicable: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might;"⁴ but in reference to the present life the following suits: "Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof."⁵ To the one, again, belongs, "Thou shalt not covet;"⁶ to the other, "Thou shalt not go after thy lusts."⁷ To the one it appertains to seek for nothing more than to continue in its perfect state;

¹ Phil. iii. 13.

² Rom. i. 17.

³ 2 Cor. v. 7.

⁴ Deut. vi. 5.

⁵ Rom. vi. 12.

⁶ Ex. xx. 17.

⁷ Ecclus. xviii. 30.

to the other it belongs actively to do the duty committed to it, and to hope as its reward for the perfection of the future life,—so that in the one the just man may live for evermore in the sight of that happiness which in this life was his object of desire; in the other, he may live by that faith whereon rests his desire for the ultimate blessedness as its certain end. (These things being so, it will be sinful in the man who walks by faith ever to consent to an unlawful delight,—in committing not only frightful deeds and crimes, but even trifling faults; sinful, if he lend an ear to a word that ought not to be listened to, or a tongue to a phrase which should not be uttered; sinful, if he entertains a thought in his heart in such a way as to wish that an evil pleasure were a lawful one, although known to be unlawful by the commandment,—for this amounts to a consent to sin, which would certainly be precipitated in act, unless fear of punishment deterred.)¹ Such just men, while living by faith, have no need to say: “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.”² And they prove that to be wrong which is written, “In Thy sight shall no man living be justified;”³ and also the passages: “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;”⁴ and, “There is no man that sinneth not;”⁵ and again, “There is not on the earth a righteous man, who doeth good and sinneth not”⁶ (both these statements are expressed in a general future sense,—“sinneth not,” “will not sin,”—not in the past time, “has not sinned”); and all other places of this purport contained in Holy Scripture. Since, however, these passages cannot possibly be false, it plainly follows, to my mind, that whatever be the quality or extent of the righteousness which we may definitively ascribe to the present life, there is not a man living in it who is absolutely free from all sin; and that it is necessary for every one to give, that it may be given to him;⁷ and to forgive, that it may be forgiven him;⁸ and whatever righteousness he has, not to

¹ [The Benedictine editor is not satisfied with the place of the lines in the parenthesis. He would put them in an earlier position, perhaps before the clause beginning with, “Only let us see to it,” etc.]

² Matt. vi. 12.

³ Ps. cxliii. 2.

⁴ 1 John i. 8.

⁵ 1 Kings viii. 46.

⁶ Ecclus.

⁷ Luke vi. 30, 38.

⁸ Luke xi. 4.

presume that he has it of himself, but from the grace of God, who justifies him, and still to go on hungering and thirsting for righteousness¹ from Him who is the living bread,² and with whom is the fountain of life;³ who works in His saints, whilst labouring amidst temptation in this life, their justification in such manner that He may still have somewhat to impart to them liberally when they ask, and something mercifully to forgive them when they confess it.

CHAP. 66.—*Although perfect righteousness be not found here on earth, it is still not impossible.*

But let objectors find, if they can, any man, while living under the weight of this corrupt nature, in whom God has no longer anything to forgive; they will still—unless they acknowledge that such an individual has been aided in the attainment of his good character not merely by the teaching of the law which God gave, but also by the infusion of grace by His Spirit—incur the charge of ungodliness itself, not of this or that particular sin. Of course they are not at all able to discover such a man, if they receive in a becoming manner the testimony of the divine writings. Still, for all that, it must not by any means be said that with God there is no possibility whereby the will of man can be assisted to such a degree, that there can be accomplished in every respect even now in a man, not that righteousness only which is of faith,⁴ but that also in accordance with which we shall by and by have to live for ever in the very vision of God. Now, suppose even that this corruptible in any particular man should wish to put on incorruption,⁵ and should desire him so to live among mortal men (not destined himself to die) that his old nature should be wholly and entirely withdrawn, and there should be no law in his members warring against the law of his mind,⁶—moreover, that he should discover God to be everywhere present, as the saints shall hereafter know and behold Him,—who will madly venture to affirm that this is impossible? Men, however, ask why it does not do this; but they who raise the question consider not duly the fact that they are human. I am quite certain that, as nothing is

¹ Matt. v. 6.

⁴ Rom. x. 6.

² John vi. 51.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 53.

³ Ps. xxxvi. 9.

⁶ Rom. vii. 23.

impossible with God,¹ so also there is no iniquity with Him.² Equally sure am I that He resists the proud, and gives grace to the humble.³ I know also that to him who had a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure, it was said, when he besought God for its removal once, twice, nay thrice: "My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness."⁴ There is, therefore, in the hidden depths of God's judgments, a certain reason why every mouth even of the righteous should be shut in their own commendation, and only opened to celebrate the praise of God. But what this certain reason is, who can calculate, who investigate, who know? So "unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor? or who hath first given to Him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of Him, and through Him, and to Him, are all things: to whom be glory for ever. Amen."⁵

¹ Luke i. 37.

² Rom. ix. 14.

³ Jas. iv. 6.

⁴ 2 Cor. xii. 7-9.

⁵ Rom. xi. 33-36.

A TREATISE
ON NATURE AND GRACE,
AGAINST PELAGIUS.

BY

AURELIUS AUGUSTINE,
BISHOP OF HIPPO;

CONTAINED IN ONE BOOK, ADDRESSED TO TIMASIUS AND JACOBUS.

WRITTEN IN THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 415.

NOTE ON THE FOLLOWING WORK.

IN a letter (169th) to Evodius, written in the course of the year A.D. 415, Augustine assigned to this work, *On Nature and Grace*, the last place of several treatises written in that year. "I have also written," says he, "an extensive book in opposition to the heresy of Pelagius, at the request of some brethren, whom he had persuaded to accept a very dangerous opinion injurious to the grace of Christ." The work had been begun, but was not completed, when Orosius sailed from Africa to Palestine, in the spring of this very year of 415; for this man, shortly after his arrival, at a council in Jerusalem, where Pelagius was present, expressly affirmed, "that the blessed Augustine had prepared a very complete answer to Pelagius' book, two of whose followers had presented the work to him, and requested him to reply to it." Jerome, also, at this very time mentioned a certain production of Augustine's, which he had not yet seen, wherein it was said that he had expressly opposed Pelagius. His words, which occur in his third dialogue against the heresy of Pelagius, are these: "It is said that he is preparing other

treatises likewise, especially against your name and opinions." Augustine, however, did not actually employ in this work of his the *name* of Pelagius, whose book he was refuting, in order that (as he says in his letter [186th] to Paulinus) he might not by personal irritation drive him into a more incurable degree of opposition; for he hoped to be of some service to his opponent, if by still maintaining friendly terms with him he might be able to spare his feelings, although he could not in duty show leniency to his writings. Thus, at least, he expresses his mind, in his book *On the Doings of Pelagius*, ch. xxiii. In this latter passage he subjoins a letter which he had received from Timasius and Jacobus, containing the expression of great gratitude to Augustine on receiving his volume *On Nature and Grace*, in which they expressed "their agreeable surprise" at the answers he had furnished to them "on every point" of the Pelagian controversy. In the following year Augustine despatched this work, along with Pelagius' own book, to John, bishop of Jerusalem, in order that that prelate might become acquainted with the views of the new heresiarch, accompanying the books with a letter to the bishop [179th]. In the course of this year 416, he had the same two treatises (his own and Pelagius') forwarded to Pope Innocent, with a letter [177th] forwarded in the name of five bishops, to which Innocent returned an answer [183d]. It may be here stated, that in this last-mentioned letter [183, n. 5], and in the foregoing epistle [177, n. 6], there is honourable mention made of Timasius and Jacobus, as "conscientious and honourable young men, servants of God, who had relinquished the hope which they had in the world by the exhortation of Pelagius himself, and continued diligently to serve God. The same persons are described in another epistle [179, n. 2] as "young men of very honourable birth, and highly educated;" and in the work *De Gestis Pelagii*, ch. xxiii., they are called "servants of God, good, and honourable men."

Julianus [who espoused the side of Pelagius], in his work addressed to Florus (book iv. n. 112, of the imperfect work), quotes this treatise of Augustine's as addressed to Timasius, and calumniously pronounces it to be written "against the freedom of the human will."

From "The Retractations," Book II. chap. 43.

"At that time there found its way into my hands a certain book of Pelagius', in which he defends, with all the argumentative skill he can muster, the nature of man, in disparagement of that grace of God whereby we are justified and become Christians. The treatise, which contains my reply to him (and in which I uphold grace, not indeed in disparagement of nature, but as that which liberates and controls nature), I have entitled *De naturâ et gratiâ* ['On Nature and Grace']. In this work there are sundry short passages, quoted by Pelagius, as the words of the Roman bishop and martyr, Xystus or Sixtus, vindicated by myself¹ as if they really were the words of this Sixtus. I thought they were, at the time; but I afterwards discovered, that Sixtus the heathen philosopher, and not Sixtus the Christian bishop, was their author. This treatise of mine begins with the words: '*Librum quem misistis*' ['The book which you sent me']."

HE BEGINS WITH AN EXAMINATION CONCERNING NATURE AND CONCERNING GRACE; HE SHOWS THAT NATURE, AS PROPAGATED FROM THE FLESH OF THE SINFUL ADAM, BEING NO LONGER WHAT GOD MADE IT AT FIRST,—FAULTLESS AND SOUND,—REQUIRES THE AID OF GRACE, IN ORDER THAT IT MAY BE REDEEMED FROM THE WRATH OF GOD, AND REGULATED FOR THE PERFECTION OF RIGHTEOUSNESS; THAT THE PENAL FAULT OF NATURE LEADS TO A MOST RIGHTEOUS PUNISHMENT; WHILST GRACE ITSELF IS NOT BESTOWED OWING TO ANY DESERTS OF OURS, BUT IS GIVEN GRATUITOUSLY: THEY, THEREFORE, WHO ARE NOT DELIVERED BY IT ARE JUSTLY CONDEMNED. HE AFTERWARDS REFUTES, WITH ANSWERS ON EVERY SEVERAL POINT, A WORK BY PELAGIUS, WHO SUPPORTS THE SELF-SAME NATURE IN OPPOSITION TO GRACE. ONE OF THE CHIEF POSITIONS OF PELAGIUS WAS, THAT A MAN COULD LIVE WITHOUT SIN; IN HIS DESIRE TO ADVANCE THIS, HE CONTENDED THAT NATURE HAD NOT BEEN WEAKENED AND CHANGED BY SIN; FOR, OTHERWISE, THE MATTER OF SIN WOULD BE ITS PUNISHMENT,—A PROPOSITION WHICH HE THINKS ABSURD,—IF THE SINNER WERE WEAKENED TO SUCH A DEGREE THAT HE ONLY COMMITTED MORE SIN. HE GOES ON TO ENUMERATE SUNDRY RIGHTEOUS MEN BOTH OF THE OLD AND OF THE NEW TESTAMENTS: DEEMING THESE TO HAVE BEEN FREE FROM SIN, HE ALLEGED THE POSSIBILITY OF AVOIDING SIN TO BE INHERENT IN MAN; AND THIS HE ATTRIBUTED TO GOD'S GRACE, ON THE GROUND THAT GOD IS THE AUTHOR OF

¹ In chap. 77.

THAT NATURE IN WHICH IS INSEPARABLY INHERENT THIS ALLEGED POSSIBILITY OF AVOIDING SIN. TOWARDS THE END OF THIS TREATISE THERE IS AN EXAMINATION OF SUNDRY EXTRACTS FROM OLD WRITERS, WHICH PELAGIUS ADDUCED IN SUPPORT OF HIS VIEWS, AND EXPRESSLY FROM HILARY, AMBROSE, AND EVEN AUGUSTINE HIMSELF.

CHAP. I. [1.]—*The occasion of publishing this work; God's righteousness, what it is.*

THE book which you sent to me, my beloved Timasius and Jacobus, I have read through hastily, but not without considerable attention, omitting only the few points which are plain enough to everybody; and I saw in it a person of most ardent zeal warm against those, who, when they ought to censure the human will in their own sins, are more forward in accusing man's nature in general, and thereby endeavour to excuse their own faults. He shows too great a warmth against this evil, which even literary authors have severely censured, with the exclamation: "The human race wrongly complains of its own nature!"¹ This same sentiment your author has also treated in a very exaggerated tone, with all the powers of his mind. I fear, however, that he will chiefly help those "who have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge," who, "being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God."² Now, what the righteousness of God is, of which [the apostle] here speaks, he immediately afterwards explains by adding: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth."³ This righteousness of God, therefore, lies not in the commandment of the law, which excites fear, but in the aid afforded by the grace of Christ, to which alone the fear of the law, as of a schoolmaster,⁴ usefully conducts. Now, the man who understands this understands why he is a Christian. "If righteousness indeed came by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."⁵ Since, however, He did not die in vain, in Him only is the ungodly man justified, to whom, as believing in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness.⁶ For all men have sinned

¹ See Sallust's Prologue to his *Jugurtha*.

² Rom. x. 2, 3.

³ Rom. x. 4.

⁴ Gal. iii. 24.

⁵ Gal. ii. 21.

⁶ Rom. iv. 5.

and come short of the glory of God, being justified freely by His blood.¹ Now, all those persons who do not think themselves to belong to the "all who have sinned and fall short of the glory of God," have of course no need to become Christians, because "they that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick;"² whence it is, that He came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.³

CHAP. 2. [II.]—*Faith in Christ not necessary to salvation, if a man without it can lead a righteous life; righteousness comes neither by the law nor by nature.*

Therefore human nature, such as is generated from the flesh of the one original transgressor, if it is self-sufficient to fulfil the law and to perfect righteousness, ought to be sure of its reward, that is, secure of everlasting life, even if in any nation or at any former time faith in the blood of Christ was quite unknown to it. For God is not so unjust as to deprive righteous persons of the reward of righteousness, because they had not announced to them the mystery of Christ's divine and human nature, which was manifested in the flesh.⁴ For how could they believe what they had not heard of; or how could they hear without a preacher?⁵ For "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ. But I say (adds he): Have they not heard? Yes, verily; their sound went out into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world."⁶ Before, however, all this could have been accomplished, previous, in fact, to the actual preaching of the gospel reaching the utmost bounds of all the earth—because there are some remote nations still (although it is said they are very few) to whom the preached gospel has not found its way,—what must human nature do, or what has it done? For it had either not heard that all this was to take place, or had not yet learnt that it was accomplished. What, I say, could it do, but believe in God who made heaven and earth, by whom also it felt that it had been itself created, and lead a right life, and by doing and believing this to accomplish His will, unimbued with any faith in the death and resurrection of Christ? Well, if this could have been done, or can

¹ Rom. iii. 23, 24.

² Matt. ix. 12.

³ Matt. ix. 13.

⁴ 1 Tim. iii. 16.

⁵ Rom. x. 14.

⁶ Rom. x. 17, 18.

still be done, then on my side I have to say what the apostle said in regard to the law: "In such a case Christ is dead in vain."¹ For if he said so much in respect of the law, which only the nation of the Jews received, how much more justly may it be said of the law of nature, which the whole human race has received? If righteousness come by nature, then Christ is dead in vain. Since, however, Christ did not die in vain, therefore human nature cannot by any means be justified and redeemed from God's most righteous wrath—in a word, from punishment—except by faith and the mystery² of the blood of Christ.

CHAP. 3. [III.]—*Nature was created sound and whole; it was afterwards corrupted by sin; penal nature the punishment of sin.*

Man's nature, indeed, was created at first faultless and without any sin; but nature, as man now has it, in which every one is born from Adam, wants the Physician, being no longer in a healthy state. All good qualities, no doubt, which it still possesses in its make, its life, its senses, its intellect, it has of the Most High God, its Creator and Maker. But the flaw, which darkens and weakens all those natural goods, it has not contracted from its blameless Creator—with a view to its having need of illumination and healing; but from that original sin, which it committed of its own free-will. Accordingly, nature having become guilty, most righteously deserves punishment. For, although we are now newly created in Christ,³ we were, for all that, children of wrath, even as others are.⁴ "But God, who is rich in mercy, for His great love wherewith He loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, by whose grace we were saved."⁵

CHAP. 4. [IV.]—*Free grace.*

This grace, however, of Christ, without which neither infants nor adults can be saved, is not bestowed for any merits, but is given *freely*,⁶ on account of which it is also called *grace*.⁶ "Being justified," says the apostle, "freely through His blood."⁷ Whence they, who are not liberated

¹ Gal. ii. 21.

² Sacramentum.

³ 2 Cor. v. 17.

⁴ Eph. ii. 3.

⁵ Eph. ii. 4, 5.

⁶ *Gratis* and *gratia*.

⁷ Rom. iii. 24.

through grace, either through their inability as yet to hear [from tenderness of age], or through their unwillingness to obey; or again through their not having received, at the time when they were unable to hear, that bath of regeneration, which they might have received and through which they might have been saved, are indeed justly condemned; because they are not without sin, either that which they have derived from their birth, or that which they have added from their own misconduct. "For all have sinned"—whether in Adam or in themselves—"and come short of the glory of God."¹

CHAP. 5. [v.]

The entire mass, therefore, incurs penalty; and if the deserved punishment of condemnation were rendered to all, it would without doubt be righteously rendered. They, therefore, who are delivered therefrom by grace are called, not vessels of their own merits, but "vessels of mercy."² But of whose mercy, if not His, Who sent Christ Jesus into the world to save sinners, whom He foreknew, and foreordained, and called, and justified, and glorified?³ Now, who could be so exceedingly mad as to refuse to give ineffable thanks to the Mercy which liberates whom it would? The man who correctly appreciated the whole subject could not possibly blame the justice of God in wholly condemning all men whatsoever.

CHAP. 6. [vi.]—*The Pelagians have very strong and active minds.*

If we are simply wise according to the Scriptures, we are not obliged to dispute against the grace of Christ, and to make statements attempting to show that human nature requires no Physician,—either in infants, because it is whole and sound; or in adults, whenever it strives by itself to achieve the righteousness which is necessary for itself. Men no doubt seem to urge shrewd opinions on these points, but it is only word-wisdom,⁴ which nullifies the cross of Christ. This, however, "is not the wisdom which descendeth from above."⁵ The words which follow in the apostle's

¹ Rom. iii. 23.² Rom. ix. 23.³ Rom. viii. 29, 30.⁴ 1 Cor. i. 17.⁵ Jas. iii. 15.

statement I am unwilling to quote; for we would rather not be thought to do an injustice to our friends, whose very strong and active minds we should be sorry to see running in a perverse, instead of an upright, course.

CHAP. 7. [VII.]—*He proceeds to confute the work of Pelagius; he refrains as yet from mentioning Pelagius' name.*

However ardent, then, is the zeal which the author of the book you have forwarded to me entertains against those who find a defence for their sins in the infirmity of human nature; not less, nay even much greater, should be our eagerness in preventing all attempts to render the cross of Christ of none effect. Of none effect, however, it is rendered, if it be contended that by any other means than by Christ's own mystery it is possible to attain to righteousness and everlasting life. This is actually done in the book to which I refer—I will not say by its author wittingly, lest I should express the judgment that he ought not to be accounted even a Christian, but, as I rather believe, unconsciously. He has done it, no doubt, with much power; I only wish that the ability he has displayed were less like that which insane persons are accustomed to exhibit.

CHAP. 8. [VIII.]—*A distinction drawn by Pelagius; an error of Pelagius about a man's being free from blame, because he could not have been otherwise.*

For he first of all indulges in a distinction: It is one thing, says he, to inquire whether a thing may be, in respect of its possibility only; and another thing, whether or not it exists. This distinction, nobody doubts, is true enough; for it follows that whatever is, was able to exist; but it does not therefore follow that what is able to exist has existence. Our Lord, for instance, raised Lazarus; He unquestionably was able to do so. But inasmuch as He did not raise up Judas, must we therefore contend that He was unable? He certainly was able, but He was not willing. For if He had been willing, He could have effected even this, as He had the same power as before.¹ For the Son quickeneth whomsoever He will.² Observe, however, what he means by

¹ Peter Lombard refers to this passage of Augustine, to show that God can do many things which He will not do. See his *1 Sent. Dist. 43*, last chapter.

² John v. 21.

this distinction, true and manifest enough in itself, and what he endeavours to make out of it. We are treating, says he, of what is possible only; to pass from which to something else, except in the case of some certain fact, we deem to be a very serious and extraordinary process. This idea he turns over again and again, in many ways and at great length, so that no one would suppose that he was inquiring about any other point than the possibility of not committing sin. Among the many passages in which he treats of this subject, occurs the following: I once more repeat my position: I say that it is possible for a man to be without sin. What do you say? That it is impossible for a man to be without sin? But I do not say, he adds, that there is a man without sin; nor do you say, that there is not a man without sin. Our contention is about what is possible, and not possible; not about what is, and is not. He then enumerates certain passages of Scripture,¹ which are usually alleged in opposition to them, and insists that they have nothing to do with the question, which is really in dispute, as to the possibility or otherwise of a man's being without sin. This is what he says: No man indeed is clean from pollution; and, There is no man that sinneth not; and, There is not a just man upon the earth; and, There is none that doeth good. There are these and similar passages in Scripture, says he, but they testify to the point of not being, not of not being able; for by testimonies of this sort it is shown what kind of persons certain men were at such and such a time, not that they were unable to be something else. Whence they are justly found to be blameworthy. If, however, they had been of such a character, simply because they were unable to be anything else, they are free from blame.

CHAP. 9. [VIII.]—*Even they who were not able to be justified are condemned.*

See now what he has in effect said: I affirm that an infant born in a place where it was not possible for him to be admitted to the baptism of Christ, and being overtaken by death, was placed in such circumstances, that is to say, died without the bath of regeneration, because it was not possible for him

¹ Job xiv. 2 (Septuagint); 1 Kings viii. 46; Eccles. vii. 21; Ps. xiv. 1.

to be otherwise. He would therefore absolve him, and, in spite of the Lord's sentence, open to him the kingdom of heaven. The apostle, however, does not absolve him, when he says: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."¹ Rightly, therefore, by virtue of that condemnation which runs throughout the mass of human nature, is he not admitted into the kingdom of heaven, although he was not only not a Christian, but was unable to become one.

CHAP. 10. [IX.]—*He could not be justified, who had not heard of the name of Christ; rendering the cross of Christ of none effect.*

But they say: There is no condemnation in the case; because the statement that all sinned in Adam, was not made because of the sin which is derived from one's birth, but because of men's imitation of him. If, therefore, Adam is said to be the author of all the sins which followed his own, because he was the first sinner of the human race, then how is it that Abel, rather than Christ, is not set down as the head of all the righteous, because he was the first righteous man? But I am not speaking of the case of an infant. I take the instance of a young man, or an old man, who has died in a neighbourhood where he could not hear of the name of Christ. Well, could such a man have become righteous by nature and free-will; or could he not? If they contend that he could, then see what it is to render the cross of Christ of none effect;² it is arguing that any man can be justified by the law of nature and his own free-will. We may here also say, Christ is dead in vain,³ forasmuch as all might accomplish so much as this, even if He had never died; now if they were unrighteous, they were so because they wished to be, not because they were unable to be righteous. But even though a man could not be justified at all without the grace of Christ, he would absolve him, if he dared, in accordance with his words, to the effect that, "if a man were of such a character, because he could not possibly have been of any other, he would be free from all blame."

CHAP. 11. [X.]

He then starts an objection to his own position, as if, in-

¹ Rom. v. 12.

² 1 Cor. i. 1.

³ Gal. ii. 21.

deed, another person had raised it, and says: "A man, you will say, may be [without sin]; but it is by the grace of God." He then at once subjoins the following, as if in answer to his own suggestion: "I thank you for your kindness, because you are not merely content to withdraw your opposition to my statement, which you long resisted, and barely to acknowledge it; but you actually go so far as to bestow your approbation on it. For to say a thing is possible, although by this or by that method, is in fact nothing else than to not only assent to its possibility, but also to show the mode and quality of its happening. Nobody, therefore, gives a better assent to the possibility of anything than the man who allows the mode or quality thereof; because, without the thing itself, it is not possible for a thing to be." After this he raises another objection against himself: "But, you will say, you here seem to reject the grace of God, inasmuch as you do not even mention it;" and he then answers the objection: "Now, is it *I* that reject grace, or *you*—I, who by acknowledging the thing must needs also confess the means by which it may be effected, or you, who by denying the thing do undoubtedly also deny whatever may be the means through which the thing is accomplished?" He forgot that he was answering one who does not deny the thing, and whose objection he had just before set forth in these words: "A man may be [without sin]; but it is by the grace of God." How then does that man deny the possibility, in defence of which his opponent earnestly contends, when he makes the admission to that opponent that "the thing is possible, but only by the grace of God?" Dismissing, however, the circumstance that he already acknowledges the essential thing, what are we to say to the fact that he still has a question against those who maintain the impossibility of a man's being without sin? Let him ply his questions against any opponents he pleases, provided he only confesses this truth, which cannot be denied without the most criminal impiety, that a man cannot be without sin except by the grace of God. He says, indeed: "Whether it be by grace, or by divine aid, or by mercy, whatever that be by which a man can be without sin, every one acknowledges the same who admits the thing itself."

CHAP. 12. [XI.]—*In our discussions about grace, we do not speak of that which relates to the constitution of our nature, but to its restitution.*

I confess to [a fellow-feeling in] your love. When I read those words I was filled with a sudden joy, because he did not deny that grace of God by which alone a man can be justified; for it is this [denial] which I mainly detest and dread in discussions of this kind. But when I went on to read the rest, I began to have my suspicions, first of all, from the similes he employs. He says: "If I were to say, man is able to dispute; a bird is able to fly; a hare is able to run; without mentioning at the same time the instruments by which these acts can be accomplished—that is, the tongue, the wings, and the legs; should I then have denied the methods of the various offices, when I acknowledged the very offices themselves?" It is at once apparent that he has here instanced such things as are by nature efficient and unimpaired; for the members of the bodily structure which are here mentioned are created with natures of such a kind—the tongue, the wings, the legs. He has not here assumed any such position as we wish to have understood by *grace*—the grace without which no man is justified; for this is a topic which is concerned about the cure, not the constitution, of natural functions. Entertaining, then, some apprehensions, I proceeded to read all the rest, and I soon found that my suspicions had not been unfounded.

CHAP. 13. [XII.]—*The scope and purpose of the law's threatenings; perfect wayfarers.*

But before I proceed further, see what he has said. When treating the question about the difference of sins, and starting as an objection to himself, what certain persons allege, "that some sins are light by their very frequency, their constant irruption making it impossible that they should be all of them avoided;" he thereupon contended that it was "improper that such offences should be censured as even light or trifling, if they are altogether unavoidable." He of course does not notice the Scriptures of the New Testament, wherein we learn¹ that the intention of the law in its censure is this, that, by reason of the transgressions which men commit, they may flee for refuge to the grace of the Lord, who has pity upon them—

¹ We have read *discimus*, not *dicimus*.

“the schoolmaster”¹ “shutting them up unto the same faith which should afterwards be revealed;”² that by it their transgressions may be forgiven, and then not again be committed, by God’s assisting grace. The road indeed belongs to all who are progressing in it; although it is they who make a good advance that are called perfect travellers. That, however, is complete perfection which admits of no addition, when the goal to which men tend has begun to be possessed.

CHAP. 14. [XIII.]

But the truth is, the question which is proposed to him—“Are you even yourself without sin?”—does not really belong to the subject in dispute. That, however, which he says, that “it is rather imputable to his own negligence that he is not without sin,” is no doubt well spoken; but then he should deem it to be his duty even to pray to God that this faulty negligence get not the dominion over him. A certain man once put up such an entreaty, when he said: “Order my steps according to Thy word, and let not any iniquity have dominion over me.”³ [Such, I say, should be his prayer,] lest, whilst relying on his own diligence as on strength of his own, he should fail to attain to the true righteousness either by this way [of self-reliance], or by that other method where, no doubt, such righteousness is to be desired and hoped for in perfection.

CHAP. 15. [XIV.]—*Not everything [of doctrinal truth] is written in Scripture in so many words.*

That, too, which is said to him, “that it is nowhere written in so many words, A man can be without sin,” he easily refutes thus: “That the question here is not in what precise words each doctrinal statement is made.” It is perhaps not without reason that, while in several passages of Scripture we may find it said that men are without complaint,⁴ it is nowhere found that any man is described as being without sin, except Him only, of whom it is plainly said, that “He knew no sin.”⁵ Similarly, we read in the passage where the subject is con-

¹ Gal. iii. 24.² Gal. iii. 23.³ Ps. cxix. 133.⁴ *Sine querela*; without complaining of their sinful malady.⁵ 2 Cor. v. 21.

cerning priests: "He was in all points tempted like as we are, only without sin,"¹—meaning, of course, in that flesh which bore the likeness of sinful flesh, although it was not sinful flesh; a likeness, indeed, which it would not have borne if it had not been in every other respect the same as sinful flesh. There is, however, a passage [which seems opposed to our statement]: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; neither can he sin, for his seed remaineth in him;"² while the Apostle John himself expressly uses language as if he had not been born of God, or else were addressing men who had not been born of God, when he lays down this position: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."³ The sense, however, in which such passages ought to be received, I have already explained, with such care as I was able, in those books which I wrote to Marcellinus on this very subject.⁴ It seems, moreover, to me to be an interpretation worthy of acceptance to regard the clause of the above quoted passage: "Neither can he sin," as if it meant: *He ought not to commit sin.* For who could be so foolish as to say that sin ought to be committed, when, in fact, sin is sin, for no other reason than that it ought not to be committed?

CHAP. 16. [xv.]—*Pelagius corrupts a passage of the Apostle James by adding a note of interrogation.*

Now that passage, in which the Apostle James says: "But the tongue can no man tame,"⁵ does not appear to me to be capable of the interpretation which he would put upon it, when he expounds it, "as if it were written by way of reproach; as much as to say: Can no man, then, tame the tongue? As if in a reproachful tone, which would say: You are able to tame wild beasts; cannot you tame the tongue? As if it were an easier thing to tame the tongue than to subjugate wild beasts." I do not think that this is the meaning of the passage. For, if he had meant such an opinion as this to be entertained of the facility of taming the tongue, there would have followed in the sequel of the passage a comparison of that member with the beasts. As it is, however, it simply

¹ Heb. iv. 15.

² 1 John iii. 9.

³ 1 John i. 8.

⁴ See the *De Peccat. Meritis et Remissione*, ii. 10.

⁵ Jas. iii. 8.

goes on to say : "The tongue is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison,"¹—such, of course, as is more noxious than that of beasts and creeping things. For while the one destroys the flesh, the other kills the soul. "The mouth that beliieth slayeth the soul."² It is not, therefore, in the sense that this is an easier achievement than the taming of beasts that St. James pronounced the statement before us, or would have others utter it; but he rather aims at showing what a great evil in man his tongue is—so great, indeed, that it cannot be tamed by any man, although even beasts are tameable by human beings. And he said so much as this, not with a view to our permitting the subjugation of so great an evil to ourselves to pass by through our neglect, but in order that we might be induced to request the help of divine grace for the taming of the tongue. For, he does not say: "None [nullus] can tame the tongue;" but "*No man* [nullus hominum];" that, when it is tamed, we may acknowledge it to be effected by the mercy, the help, the grace of God. The soul, therefore, should endeavour to tame the tongue, and while endeavouring should pray for assistance; the tongue, too, should beg for the taming of the tongue,—He being the tamer who said to His disciples: "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."³ So that we are warned and taught by such a precept to do this,—namely, first make the attempt, and, failing in our own strength, then to pray for the help of God.

CHAP. 17. [XVI.]

Accordingly, after emphatically describing the evil of the tongue—saying, among other things: "My brethren, these things ought not so to be"⁴—he at once, after finishing some suitable remarks which arose out of his subject, goes on to add this advice, showing by what help those things would not happen, which (as he said) ought not to be: "Who is a wise man and endowed with knowledge among you? Let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not and lie not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where there

¹ Jas. iii. 8.² Wisd. i. 11.³ Matt. x. 20.⁴ Jas. iii. 10.

is envying and strife, there is confusion and every evil work. But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy.”¹ This is the wisdom which tames the tongue; it descends from heaven, but springs from no human heart. Will any one, then, dare to divorce it from the grace of God, and with most arrogant vanity place it in the power of man? Why should I pray to God that it be accorded me, if it is of man that it must be obtained? Is it not a contradiction to such prayer to apprehend any injury being done to that free-will which is self-sufficient in natural ability for discharging all the duties of righteousness? It must, therefore, be a contradiction even to the Apostle James himself, who admonishes us in these words: “If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him; but let him ask in faith, nothing doubting.”² This is the faith to which the commandments drive us, in order that the law may prescribe our duty and faith accomplish it.³ For through the tongue, which no man can tame, but only the wisdom which comes down from above, “in many things we all of us offend.”⁴ For this truth also the same apostle pronounced in no other sense than that which he afterwards declares [in the words already quoted]: “The tongue no man can tame.”⁵

CHAP. 18. [XVII.]—*Who may be said to be in the flesh.*

There is a passage which nobody could place against these texts with the similar purpose of showing the impossibility of not sinning: “The carnal mind [or wisdom of the flesh] is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be; so then they that are in the flesh cannot please God;”⁶ for he here mentions the wisdom of the flesh, not the wisdom which cometh from above: moreover, it is manifest, that in this passage, by the phrase, “being in the flesh,” are signified, not those who have not yet quitted the body, but those who live after the flesh. The question, however, we are discussing does not lie in this point. But what

¹ Jas. iii. 13–17.

² Jas. i. 5, 6.

³ Ut lex imperet et fides impetret.

⁴ Jas. iii. 2.

⁵ Jas. iii. 8.

⁶ Rom. viii. 7, 8.

I want to hear from him, if I can, is [his opinion] about those who live after the Spirit, and who on this account are not in a certain sense in the flesh, even while they still live here,—whether [he thinks that] they, by God's grace, live after the flesh, or have resources enough of their own, natural capability having been bestowed on them when they were created, and their own proper will besides. Whereas the fulfilling of the law is nothing else than love;¹ and God's love is shed abroad in our hearts, not by our own selves, but by the Holy Ghost which is given to us.²

CHAP. 19.—*Sins of ignorance; to whom wisdom is given by God on their requesting it.*

He further treats on sins of ignorance, and says that "a man ought to be very careful to avoid ignorance; and that ignorance is blameworthy for this reason, because it is through his own neglect that a man is ignorant of that which he certainly must have known if he had only applied diligence;" whereas he prefers disputing all things rather than pray, and say: "Give me understanding, that I may learn Thy commandments."³ It is, indeed, one thing to have taken no pains to know what sins of negligence were apparently expiated through divers sacrifices of the law; it is another thing to wish, but to be unable to understand, and then to act contrary to the law, through not understanding what it would have done. We are accordingly enjoined to ask of God wisdom, "who giveth to all men liberally;"⁴ that is, of course, to all men who ask in such a manner, and to such an extent, as so great a matter requires in earnestness of petition.

CHAP. 20. [XVIII.]—*What prayer Pelagius would admit to be necessary. It is foolish to pray that you may do what you have in your own control.*

He confesses that "sins which have been committed do notwithstanding require divine interposition for their atonement, and that the Lord must be entreated because of them,"—that is, for the purpose, of course, of obtaining pardon; "because that which has been done cannot," it is his own admission, "be undone," by that "power of nature and will of man" which he talks about so much. From this necessity therefore it follows that a man must pray to be forgiven. That a man,

¹ Rom. xiii. 10.

² Rom. v. 5.

³ Ps. cxix. 73.

⁴ Jas. i. 5.

however, requires to be helped not to sin, he has nowhere admitted; I read no such admission in this passage; he keeps a strange silence on this subject altogether; although the Lord's Prayer enjoins upon us the necessity of praying both that our debts may be remitted to us, and that we may not be led into temptation,—the one petition entreating that past offences may be atoned for; the other, that future ones may be avoided. Now, although this is never done unless our will be assistant, yet our will alone is not enough to secure its being done; the prayer, therefore, which is offered up to God for this result is neither superfluous nor offensive to the Lord. For what is more foolish than to pray that you may do that which you have it in your own power to do?

CHAP. 21. [XIX.]—*Pelagius denies that human nature has been depraved or corrupted by sin.*

You may now see (what bears very closely on our subject) how he endeavours to exhibit human nature, as if it were wholly without fault, and how he struggles against the plainest of God's Scriptures with that "word-wisdom"¹ which renders the cross of Christ of none effect. That cross, however, shall certainly never be so impaired; rather shall such wisdom be subverted. Now, after we shall have demonstrated this, it may be that God's mercy may visit him, so that he may be sorry that he ever expressed the following sentiments: "We have," he says, "first of all to discuss the position which is maintained, that our nature has been weakened and changed by sin. I think," continues he, "that before all other things we have to inquire what sin is,—whether it be a substance, or an entirely unsubstantial name, whereby is expressed not a reality, not an existence, not a body, but the doing of a wrongful deed." He then adds: "I suppose that this is the case; and if so," he asks, "how could that which lacks all substance have possibly weakened or changed human nature?" Observe, I beg of you, how in his ignorance he struggles to overthrow the most salutary words of the remedial Scriptures: "I said, O Lord, be merciful unto me; heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee."² Now, how can a thing be healed, if it is not wounded nor hurt, nor weakened and vitiated?

¹ 1 Cor. i. 17.

² Ps. xli. 4.

But, as there is here something to be healed, whence did it receive its injury? You hear [the Psalmist] confessing the fact; what need is there of discussion? He says: "Heal my soul." Ask him how that which he wants to be healed became injured, and then listen to his following words: "Because I have sinned against Thee." If, however, *he* were to put a question [to the Psalmist], and ask him what he deemed a suitable inquiry, and say: O you who exclaim, Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee! pray tell me what sin is? Is it a substance or an entirely unsubstantial name, whereby is expressed, not a reality, not an existence, not a body, but merely the doing of a wrongful deed? Then the other returns for answer: It is even as you say; sin is not a substance; under its name there is merely expressed the doing of a wrongful deed. But he rejoins: Then why cry out, Heal my soul, for I have sinned against Thee? How could that have possibly vitiated your soul which lacks all substance? Then would the other, worn out with the anguish of his wound, in order to avoid being diverted from prayer by the discussion, briefly answer and say: Go from me, I beseech you; rather discuss the point, if you can, with Him who said: "They that are whole need no physician, but they that are sick; I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners,"¹—in which words, of course, He designated the righteous as the whole, and sinners as the sick.

CHAP. 22. [XX.]—*How our nature could be vitiated by sin, even though it be not a substance.*

Now, do you not perceive the tendency and direction of this controversy? Even to render of none effect the Scripture where it is said: "Thou shalt call His name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins."² For how is He to save where there is no malady? For the sins, from which this gospel says Christ's people have to be saved, are not substances, and according to him are incapable of vitiating [our nature]. My brother, how good a thing it is to remember that you are a Christian! To believe, as you would have us, might perhaps be enough; but still, since you persist in discussion, there is no harm, nay there is even benefit, if a firm

¹ Matt. ix. 12, 13.

² Matt. i. 21.

faith precede it; if, too, we refrain from thinking that human nature cannot be vitiated by sin; but rather, believing, after the inspired Scriptures, that it is thereby vitiated, let our inquiry be how this could possibly have come about. Since, then, we have already learnt that sin is not a substance, do we not consider, not to mention any other example, that not to eat is also not a substance? Because such abstinence is withdrawal from a substance, inasmuch as food is a substance. To abstain, then, from food is not a substance; and yet the substance of our body, if it does altogether abstain from food, so languishes, is so impaired by broken health, is so exhausted of strength, so weakened and broken with very weariness, that even if it be in any way able to continue alive, it is hardly capable of being restored to the use of that food, by abstaining from which it became so vitiated and injured. In the same way sin is not a substance; but God is a substance, yea the highest substance and only true sustenance of the reasonable creature. The consequence of departing from Him by disobedience, and of being unable, through infirmity, to receive what one ought really to rejoice in, you hear from the Psalmist, when he says: "My heart is smitten and withered like grass, since I have forgotten to eat my bread."¹

CHAP. 23. [XXI.]—*Adam delivered by the mercy of Christ.*

But observe how, by specious arguments, he continues to oppose the truth of Holy Scripture. The Lord Jesus, who is called Jesus because He saves His people from their sins,² in accordance with this His merciful character, says: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick; I am come not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance."³ Accordingly, His apostle also says: "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners."⁴ This man, however, contrary to the faithful and all-acceptable saying, declares that "this sickness of man's nature could not have been contracted by sins, else the punishment of sin would amount to this, that more sins would be committed." Even infants require the help of the Great Physician. This writer asks: "Why want Him for

¹ Ps. cii. 4.

² Matt. i. 21.

³ Matt. ix. 12.

⁴ 1 Tim. i. 15.

them? They are already whole for whom you propose to fetch the Physician. Not even was the first man condemned to die for any such reason, for he committed no sin afterwards." As if he had ever heard anything of his subsequent perfection in righteousness, except so far as the Church commends to our faith that even Adam was delivered by the mercy of the Lord [Jesus] Christ. "As to his posterity also," says he, "not only are they not more infirm than he, but they actually fulfilled more commandments than he ever did, since he neglected to fulfil even one." The posterity which [our author] sees born with such faculties, though certainly not made as Adam was, are not only unequal to the commandment, which they are altogether inexperienced in, but they are hardly capable of sucking the breast, when their appetite craves; yet even these would He have to be saved in the bosom of Mother Church by His grace Who saves His people from their sins; but these men gainsay such grace, and, as if they had a deeper insight into the creature than ever He possesses who made the creature, they pronounce [these infants] sound with an assurance which is anything but sound itself.

CHAP. 24. [XXII.]—*Sin and the penalty of sin the same. Blindness of the heart.*

"The very matter," says he, "of sin must also be its punishment, since the sinner is so much weakened that he commits more sins." He does not consider how justly the light of truth forsakes the man who transgresses the law. When thus deserted, he of course becomes blinded, and necessarily goes on committing offences; by so falling he is embarrassed, and being embarrassed he fails to rise, even so far as to hear the voice of the law, which admonishes him to beg for the Saviour's grace. Is no punishment due to them of whom the apostle says: "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened?"¹ This darkening was, of course, already their punishment; and yet through this very penalty—that is, through their blindness of heart, which supervenes on the withdrawal of the light of wisdom—they fell into more grievous

¹ Rom. i. 21.

sins still. For giving themselves out as wise, they became fools. This is a grievous penalty, if one only understand it; and from such a penalty only see to what lengths they ran: "They changed," as the apostle goes on to say, "the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things."¹ All this they did owing to that penalty of their sin, whereby their foolish heart was darkened. And yet, owing to these deeds of theirs, which, although coming in the way of punishment, were none the less sins, he goes on to say: "Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts."² See how severely God condemned them, giving them over to uncleanness in the very desires of their heart. Observe also the sins they commit owing to such condemnation: "To dishonour," says he, "their own bodies among themselves."³ Here is the punishment of iniquity, which is itself iniquity; a fact which sets forth in a clearer light the words which follow: "Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause," says he, "God gave them up unto vile affections."⁴ See how often God inflicts punishment; and out of the self-same punishment sins, more numerous and more severe, arise. "For even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature; and likewise the men also, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly."⁵ Then, to show that these things were not only sins themselves, but were also the penalties of sins, he further says: "And receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet."⁶ Observe how often it happens that the very punishment which God inflicts begets other sins as its natural offspring. Attend still further: "And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge," says he, "God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit,

¹ Rom. i. 23.⁴ Rom. i. 25, 26.² Rom. i. 24.⁵ Rom. i. 26, 27.³ Rom. i. 24.⁶ Rom. i. 27.

malignity ; whisperers, backbiters, haters of God, spiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, without understanding, covenant-breakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful.”¹ Here, now, let our opponent say : “ Sin ought not to have been punished in this way, that the sinner, through his punishment, should commit even more sins.”

CHAP. 25. [XXIII.]—*God only forsakes those who deserve to be forsaken. We are ourselves sufficient to commit sin ; but we are not able to return to the way of righteousness. Death is the punishment, not the cause of sin. There is nothing good without grace.*

Perhaps he may say in answer : God does not compel men to do these things ; He only leaves those alone who deserve to be forsaken. If he does say this, he says what is most true. For, as I have already remarked, those who are forsaken by the light of righteousness, and are therefore groping in darkness, produce nothing else than those works of darkness which I have enumerated ; until such time as it is said to them, and they obey the command : “ Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.”² Truth designates them as dead ; whence the passage : “ Let the dead bury their dead.” The truth [I repeat] designates as *dead* those whom he declares to have been incapable of receiving hurt or damage from sin, on the ground, forsooth, that he has discovered sin to be no substance. Nobody tells him that “ man was so formed as to be able to pass from righteousness to sin, and yet not be able to return from sin to righteousness.” But that freedom of his will, whereby man vitiated his own self, was sufficient for his falling into sin ; in order, however, for him to return to righteousness, he has need of a Physician, since he is out of health ; and requires one to revive him, because he is dead. Now about such grace as this he says not a word, as if he were able to cure himself by his own will and choice, since this alone was able to ruin him. Nor do we tell him that “ the death of the body is enough to produce sin,” because it is only its punishment ; for no one sins by undergoing the death of his body. The death of the soul, however, is conducive to sin, forsaken as it

¹ Rom. i. 28-31.

² Eph. v. 14.

is by its life, that is, God ; and it must needs produce dead works, until it revives by the grace of Christ. God forbid that we should assert that "hunger and thirst and other bodily sufferings necessarily produce sin." The life of the righteous, when exercised by such ailments, only shines out with greater lustre, and procures a greater glory by overcoming them through patience ; but then it is assisted by the grace, by the Spirit, by the mercy of God ; not exalting itself in an arrogant will, but eliciting courage by a humble confession. For it had learnt to say unto God : "Thou art my hope ; Thou art my trust."¹ Now, how it happens that concerning this grace, and help and mercy, without which we cannot live, he has nothing to say, I am at a loss to know. But he goes further, and in the most open manner gainsays the grace of Christ, whereby we are justified, by insisting on the self-sufficiency of nature to work righteousness, provided only the will be present. The reason, however, why, after sin has been released from its guilt by grace, or the exercise of faith, there should still remain the death of the body, which proceeds from sin, I have already explained, according to my ability, in those books which I wrote to Marcellinus of blessed memory.²

CHAP. 26. [XXIV.]—*Christ died of His own power and choice.*

As to his statement, indeed, that "the Lord was able to die without sin," [we may observe, in reply,] that being born also was in His case the choice and capacity of His mercy, not the condition of His nature : so, likewise, did He undergo death of His own choice and power ; and this is, in fact, our ransom, the price He paid to redeem us from death. Now, this truth their contention labours hard to nullify ; for human nature is maintained by them to be so [complete], that with its freedom of will it wants no such ransom in order to be translated from the power of darkness, and of him who has the power of death,³ into the kingdom of Christ the Lord.⁴ And yet, when the

¹ Ps. lxxi. 5.

² [The tribune Marcellinus had been put to death, in the September of 413, "having, though innocent, fallen a victim to the cruel hatred of the tyrant Heraclius," as Jerome writes in his book iii. against the Pelagians. Honorius mentions him as a "man of conspicuous renown," in a law enacted August 30, in the year 414, contained in the *Cod. Theod.* xvi. 5 (de hæreticis), line 55.]

³ Heb. ii. 14.

⁴ Col. i. 13.

Lord approached His passion, He said, "Behold, the prince of this world cometh and shall find nothing in me,"¹—and therefore no sin, of course, owing to which he might exercise dominion over Him, so as to destroy Him. "But," added He, "that the world may know that I do the will of my Father, arise, let us go hence;"² as much as to say, I am going to die, not through the necessity of sin, but in the voluntariness of my own obedient will.

CHAP. 27.—*Even evils, through God's mercy, are of use.*

He asserts that "no evil is the cause of anything good;" as if punishment, forsooth, were a good; although thereby many have been reformed. There are, then, evils which are of use by the wondrous mercy of God. Did that man experience some good thing, when he said, "Thou didst hide Thy face from me, and I was troubled?"³ Certainly not; and yet this very trouble was to him in a certain manner a remedy against his pride. For he had said in his prosperity, "I shall never be moved;"⁴ and so was ascribing to himself what he was receiving from the Lord. "For what had he that he did not receive?"⁵ It had, therefore, become necessary to show him whence he had received everything, that he might receive in humility what he had lost in pride. Accordingly, he says, "In Thy good pleasure, O Lord, Thou didst add strength to my beauty."⁶ In this abundance of mine I once used to say, "I shall not be moved;" whereas it all came from Thee, not from myself. Then at last Thou didst turn away Thy face from me, and I became troubled.

CHAP. 28. [XXV.]—*The disposition of nearly all who go astray. With some heretics our business ought not to be disputation but prayer. The gravity of Adam's sin.*

Man's proud disposition has no relish at all for this; God, however, is great, in persuading even *it* how to find it all out. We are, indeed, more inclined to seek how best to reply to such arguments as oppose our going astray, than eager to experience how salutary would be our condition if we were free from error. We ought, therefore, to encounter all such [restive tempers],

¹ John xiv. 30.

² John xiv. 31.

³ Ps. xxx. 7.

⁴ Ps. xxx. 8.

⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

⁶ Ps. xxx. 7 (Septuagint).

not by discussions, but rather by prayers both for them and for ourselves. For we never say to them, what this opponent has paradoxically advanced to himself, that "sin was necessary in order that there might be a cause for God's mercy." Would there had never been misery to need that mercy! But the iniquity of sin,—which is so much the greater in proportion to the ease wherewith man might have avoided sin, whilst no infirmity did as yet beset him,—has been followed closely up by a most righteous punishment; even that [offending man] should receive in himself the mutual reward of his sin, losing that obedience of his body which had been in some degree put under his own control, and which he had despised when it was so remarkably displayed in his Lord. And, inasmuch as we are now born with the self-same law of sin, which in our members resists the law of our mind, we ought never to murmur against God, nor to dispute in opposition to the clearest fact, but to seek and pray for His mercy instead of our punishment.

CHAP. 29. [XXVI.]—*A simile to show that God's grace is necessary for doing any good work whatever. God never forsakes the justified man if He be not Himself forsaken.*¹

Observe, indeed, how cautiously he expresses himself: "God, no doubt, applies His mercy even to this object, whenever it is necessary; because man after sin requires help in this way,—not because God wished there should be a cause for such necessity." Do you not see how he does not say that God's grace is necessary to prevent us from sinning, but because we have sinned? Then he adds: "But just in the same way it is the duty of a physician to be ready to cure a man who is already wounded; although he ought not to wish for a man who is sound and whole to be wounded." Now, if this simile suits the subject of which we are treating, human nature is certainly incapable of receiving a wound from sin, inasmuch as sin is not a substance. As therefore, for example's sake, a man who is lamed by a wound is cured for the simple purpose of his step for the future being direct and strong, now that its past infirmity is healed, so does the Heavenly Physician cure our maladies, not only that they may cease any longer to

¹ [See the treatise *De Peccatorum Meritis*, ii. 22.]

exist, but in order that we may ever afterwards be able to walk aright,—an accomplishment to which we should be unequal, even after our healing, except by His continued help. For after a medical man has administered a cure, in order that the patient may be afterwards duly nourished with bodily elements and aliments, for the completion and continuance of the said cure by suitable means and help, he commends him to God's good care, who bestows these aids on all who live in the flesh, and from whom proceeded even those means which [the physician] applied during the process of the cure. It is not out of any resources which he has himself created that the medical man effects any cure, but out of the resources of Him who creates all things which are required by the whole and by the sick. God, however, unless He be first forsaken, never withdraws His help from men, that they may lead constant lives of piety and holiness, whenever He—through “the one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus”—spiritually heals the sick or raises the dead, that is, justifies the ungodly; and after He has brought him to perfect health, in other words, to the fulness of life and righteousness. For, just as the eye of the body, even when completely sound, is unable to see unless aided by the brightness of light, so also man, even when most fully justified, is unable to lead a holy life, if he be not divinely assisted by the eternal light of righteousness. God, therefore, heals us not only that He may blot out the sin which we have committed, but, furthermore, that He may enable us even to avoid sinning.

CHAP. 30. [XXVII.]—*Sin is removed by sin.*

He no doubt shows some acuteness in handling, and turning over and exposing, as he likes, and refuting a certain statement, which is made to this effect, that “it was really necessary to man, in order to take from him all occasion for pride and boasting, that he should be unable to exist without sin.” [In answer to this,] he supposes it to be “the height of absurdity and folly, that there should have been sin in order that sin might not be; inasmuch as pride is itself, of course, a sin.” As if a sore were not attended with pain, and an operation did not produce pain, that pain might be remedied by pain.

If we had not experienced any such treatment, but were only to hear about it in some parts of the world where these things had never happened, we might perhaps use this man's words, and say, It is the height of absurdity that pain should have been necessary in order that a sore should have no pain.

CHAP. 31.—*The order and process of healing our heavenly Physician does not adopt from the sick patient, but derives from Himself. What cause the righteous have for fearing.*

“But God,” they say, “is able to heal all things.” It is quite true that He so acts as to heal all things; but He acts on His own judgment, and does not take His procedure in healing from the sick man. For undoubtedly it was His will to endow His apostle with very great power and strength, and yet He said to him: “My strength is made perfect in weakness;”¹ nor did He remove from him, though he so often entreated Him to do so, that mysterious “thorn in the flesh,” which He told him had been given to him “lest he should be unduly exalted through the abundance of the revelation.”² For all other sins only prevail in evil deeds; *pride only has to be guarded against in things that are rightly done.* Whence it happens that those persons are admonished not to attribute to their own power the gifts of God, nor to plume themselves thereon, lest by so doing they should perish with a heavier perdition than if they had done no good at all, to whom it is said: “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of His good pleasure.”³ Why, then, must it be with fear and trembling, and not rather with security, since God is working; except it be because there so quickly steals over our human soul, by reason of our will (without which we can do nothing well), the inclination to esteem simply as our own accomplishment whatever good we do; and so each one of us says in his prosperity: “I shall never be moved?”⁴ Therefore, He who in His good pleasure had added strength to our beauty, turns away His face, and the man who had made his boast becomes troubled, because it is by actual sorrows that the swelling pride must be remedied.

¹ 2 Cor. xii. 9.

³ Phil. ii. 12, 13.

² 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8.

⁴ Ps. xxx. 6.

CHAP. 32. [XXVIII.]—*God forsakes us sometimes that we may not grow proud.*

Therefore it is never said to a man: "It is necessary for you to sin that you may not sin;" but it is said to a man: God sometimes forsakes you, in consequence of which you grow proud, that you may know that you are "not your own," but are His¹—and so learn not to be proud. Now even that incident in the apostle's [life, to which we have just referred,] is of such a kind, not to say so wonderful, that were it not for the fact that he himself is the voucher for it whom it is impious to contradict, truthful as he is, it would be incredible. For what believer is there who is ignorant of the fact that the first incentive to sin came from Satan, and that he is the primary author of all sins? And yet, for all that, some are "delivered over unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme."² How comes it to pass, then, that Satan's work is excluded and prevented by the work of Satan? These and such like questions let a man regard in such a light that they seem not to him to be too acute; they have somewhat of the sound of acuteness, and yet when discussed are found to be obtuse. What must we say also to our author's use of similes? But he only thereby rather suggests to us the answer which we should give to himself. "What" (asks he) "shall I say more than this, that we may as well believe that fires are quenched by fires, if we may believe that sins are cured by sins?" What if one cannot put out fires by fires: pains can, for all that, as I have shown, be cured by pains. Poisons can also, if one only inquire and learn the fact, be expelled by poisons. Now, if he observes that the heats of fevers are sometimes subdued by certain medicinal warmths, he will perhaps also allow that fires may be extinguished by fires.

CHAP. 33. [XXIX.]—*Not every sin is pride. How pride is the commencement of every sin.*

"But how," asks he, "shall we separate pride itself from sin?" Now, why does he raise such a question, when it is manifest that even pride itself is a sin? "To sin," says he, "is quite as much to be proud, as to be proud is to sin; for only ask what every sin is, and see whether you can find any sin unaccompanied by the designation of pride." Then he

¹ 1 Cor. vi. 19.

² 1 Tim. i. 20.

thus pursues this opinion, and endeavours to prove it thus: "Every sin," says he, "if I mistake not, is a contempt of God, and every contempt of God is pride. For what is so proud as to despise God? All sin, then, is also pride, even as Scripture says, Pride is the beginning of all sin."¹ Let him seek diligently, and he will find in the law that the sin of pride is quite distinguished from all other sins. For many sins are committed through pride; but yet not all things which are wrongly done are done proudly,—at any rate, not by the ignorant, not by the infirm, and not, generally speaking, by the weeping and sorrowful. And indeed pride, although it be in itself a great sin, is so in itself alone without any others; so that, as I have already remarked, it for the most part advances with swifter, though still stealthy foot, in things which are actually well done, and not so much in sins. However, that which he has understood in another sense, is after all most truly said: "Pride is the commencement of all sin;" because it was this which overthrew the devil, from whom arose the origin of sin; and afterwards, when his malice and envy pursued man, who was yet standing in his uprightness, it subverted him in the same way in which he himself fell. For the serpent, in fact, only sought for the door of pride whereby to enter when he said [to the man and the woman:] "Ye shall be as gods."² Truly then is it said, "Pride is the commencement of all sin;"³ and, "The beginning of pride is when a man departeth from God."⁴

CHAP. 34. [XXX.]

Well, but what does he mean when he says: "Then again, how shall one be subjected to God for the guilt of that sin, which he knows is not his own? For," says he, "his own it cannot be, since it is committed under necessity. Otherwise, if it is his own, it proceeds from his will; and if it is voluntary, it may be avoided." We reply: It is unquestionably his own. But the fault by which sin is committed is not yet in every respect healed, and the fact of its becoming permanently fixed in us arises from our not rightly using the healing virtue; and so out of this faulty condition the man

¹ Ecclus. x. 13.

² Gen. iii. 5.

³ Ecclus. x. 13.

⁴ Ecclus. x. 12.

who is now growing strong in depravity commits many sins, either through infirmity or blindness. Prayer must therefore be made for him, that he may be healed, and that he may thenceforward attain to a life of uninterrupted soundness of health; nor must pride be indulged in, as if any man were healed by the self-same power whereby he became morally diseased.

CHAP. 35. [XXXI.]—*Why God does not immediately cure pride itself. The secret and insidious growth of pride. Preventing and subsequent grace.*

But I would indeed so treat these topics, as to confess myself ignorant of God's deeper counsel, why He does not at once heal the very principle of pride, which insidiously overspreads man's heart; and for the cure of which pious souls, with tears and strong crying, beseech Him that He would stretch forth His right hand and help their endeavours to overcome it, and in a certain sense tread and crush it under foot. Now when a man has felt glad that he has even by some good work overcome pride, from the very joy he lifts up his head and says: Behold, I live; why do you triumph? Nay, I live because you triumph. Premature, however, this forwardness of his to triumph over pride may perhaps be, as if it were now vanquished, whereas its last shadow is to be absorbed, as I suppose, in that noontide which is promised in the scripture which says, "He shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the noonday;"¹ provided that be done which was written in the preceding verse: "Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in Him, and He shall bring it to pass,"²—not, as some suppose, that they themselves bring it to pass. Now, when he said, "And He shall bring it to pass," he evidently intended none but those who say, We ourselves bring it to pass; that is to say, we are ourselves the justifiers of our own selves. No doubt, even where we ourselves work, we are fellow-workers with Him who co-operates with us, because His mercy prevents us. He prevents us, however, that we may be healed; but then He will also follow us, that being healed we may grow healthy and strong. He prevents us that we may be called; He will follow us that we may be glorified. He prevents us that we may lead godly lives; He will follow us that we may always live with

¹ Ps. xxxvii. 6.

² Ps. xxxvii. 5.

Him, because without Him we can do nothing.¹ Now the Scriptures refer to both these operations of grace. There is both this: "The God of my mercy shall prevent me,"² and again this: "Thy mercy shall follow me all the days of my life."³ Let us therefore unveil to Him our life by confession, not praise it with a vindication. For if it is not His way but our own, beyond doubt it is not the right one. Let us therefore reveal this by making our confession to Him; for however much we may endeavour to conceal it, it is not hid from Him. It is a good thing to confess unto the Lord.

CHAP. 36. [XXXII].—*There is nothing right without grace. Pride even in such things as are done aright must be avoided. Free will is not taken away when grace is preached.*

Thus will He bestow on us whatever pleases Him. If there be anything displeasing to Him in us, it ought also to be displeasing to us. "He will," as the Scripture has said, "turn aside our paths from His own way,"⁴ and will make our way that which is His own; because it is by Himself that the favour is bestowed on such as believe in Him and hope in His name, of having their way made by His very self. Now there is a way of righteousness of which they are ignorant "who have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge,"⁵ and who, wishing to make up a righteousness of their own, "have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God."⁶ "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth;"⁷ and He has said, "I am the way."⁸ God's voice, however, has alarmed even those who have already begun to walk in this way, lest they should be lifted up, as if it were by their own energies that they were walking therein. For the same persons to whom the apostle, on account of this danger, says, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of His good pleasure,"⁹ are likewise for the self-same reason admonished in the psalm: "Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice in Him with trembling. Accept correction, lest at any time the Lord be angry, and ye

¹ John xv. 5.

⁴ See Ps. xlv. 18 (Sept.).

⁷ Rom. x. 4.

² Ps. lix. 10.

⁵ Rom. x. 2.

⁸ John xiv. 6.

³ Ps. xxiii. 6.

⁶ Rom. x. 3.

⁹ Phil. ii. 12.

perish from the righteous way, when His wrath shall be suddenly kindled upon you.”¹ He does not say, “Lest at any time the Lord be angry and refuse to show you the righteous way,” or, “refuse to lead you into the way of righteousness;” but even after you are walking therein, he goes so far in his tone of alarm as to say, “Lest ye perish from the righteous way.” Now, whence could this arise if not from pride, which (as I have so often said, and must repeat again and again) has to be guarded against even in things which are rightly done, that is, in the very way of righteousness, lest a man, by regarding as his own that which is really God’s, lose what is God’s and be reduced merely to what is his own? Let us then carry out the concluding injunction of this same psalm, “Blessed are all they that trust in Him,”² so that He may Himself indeed effect and Himself show His own way in us, to whom it is said, “Show us Thy mercy, O Lord;”³ and Himself bestow on us the pathway of safety that we may walk therein, to whom the prayer is offered, “And grant us Thy salvation;”⁴ and Himself lead us in the self-same way, to whom again it is said, “Guide me, O Lord, in Thy way, and in Thy truth will I walk;”⁵ Himself, too, conduct us to those promises whither His way leads, to whom it is said, “Even there shall Thy hand lead me and Thy right hand shall hold me;”⁶ Himself pasture therein those who sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of whom it is said, “He shall make them sit down to meat, and will come forth and serve them.”⁷ Now we do not, when we make mention of these [acts of the Lord,] take away the freedom of man’s will, but we preach the grace of God. For to whom are those gracious gifts of use, but to the man who uses, and humbly uses, his own will, and who does not make any boast of the power and energy thereof, as if it alone were sufficient for perfecting him in righteousness?

CHAP. 37. [XXXIII.]—*Being wholly without sin does not put man on an equality with God. The blessed are not changed into the substance of God.*

God forbid that we should meet him with such an assertion as he says certain persons advance against him: “That man

¹ Ps. ii. 11, 12.

² Ps. ii. 12.

³ Ps. lxxxv. 7.

⁴ Ps. lxxxv. 7.

⁶ Ps. lxxxvi. 11.

⁶ Ps. cxxxix. 10.

⁷ Luke xii. 37.

is placed on a par with God, if he is described as being without sin;" as if indeed an angel, because he is without sin, is put in such an equality. For my own part, I am of opinion that the creature will never become equal with God, even when so perfect a holiness shall be accomplished in us, that it shall be quite incapable of receiving any addition. No; all who maintain that our progress is to be so complete that we shall be changed into the substance of God, and that we shall thus become what He is, should look well to it how they build up their opinion; upon myself I must confess that it produces no conviction.

CHAP. 38. [XXXIV.]—*We must not lie, even for the sake of moderation. The praise of humility must not be placed to the account of falsehood.*

I am favourably disposed, indeed, to the view of our author, when he resists those who say to him, "What you assert is undoubtedly reasonable enough in appearance, but it is an arrogant thing to allege that any man can be without sin," with this answer, that if it is at all true, it must not on any account be called an arrogant statement, for with very great truth and acuteness he asks, "On what side must humility be placed? No doubt on the side of falsehood, if you prove arrogance to exist on the side of truth." And so he decides, and rightly decides, that humility should rather be ranged on the side of truth, not of falsehood. Whence it follows that he who said, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us,"¹ must without hesitation be held to have spoken the truth, and not seem to have advanced what is false under the guise of humility. Therefore he added the words, "And the truth is not in us;" whereas it might perhaps have been enough if he merely said, "We deceive ourselves," if he had not observed that some were capable of supposing that the clause "we deceive ourselves" is here employed on the ground that the man who praises himself is even extolled for a really good action. So that, by the addition of "the truth is not in us," he clearly shows (even as our author most correctly observes) that it is not at all true if we say that we have no sin, lest humility, if placed on the side of falsehood, should lose the praise and guerdon of truth.

¹ 1 John i. 8.

CHAP. 39.

Beyond this, however, although he flatters himself that he vindicates the cause of God by defending nature, he forgets that by predicating soundness of the said nature, he rejects the Physician's mercy. He, however, who created him is also his Saviour. We ought not, therefore, so to magnify the Creator as to be under the necessity, nay, rather incur the guilt, of declaring the Saviour to be superfluous. Man's nature indeed we may honour with distinguished praise, and attribute the praise to the Creator's glory; but at the same time, while we show our gratitude to Him for having created us, let us not be ungrateful to Him for healing us. Our sins which He heals we must undoubtedly attribute not to God's operation, but to the wilfulness of man, and submit them to *His* righteous correction; as, however, we acknowledge that it was in our power that they should not be committed, so let us confess that it lies in His mercy rather than in our own power that they should be healed. But this mercy and remedial help of the Saviour, according to this writer, consists only in this, that He forgives the transgressions that are past, not that He helps us to avoid such as are to come. Here he is most fatally mistaken; here, however unwittingly, he hinders us from being watchful, and from praying that "we enter not into temptation," since he maintains that it simply lies without our own control that this should not happen to us.

CHAP. 40. [XXXV.]—*Why there is a record in Scripture of certain men's sins. Recklessness in sins accounts it to be so much loss whenever it falls short in gratifying the instigation of lust.*

The man who is endowed with a sound opinion does not say [what our author says,] "That the instances of certain persons, of whose sinning we read in Scripture, are recorded for this purpose, that they may discourage recklessness in sinning, nor seem in any way to afford to us security in committing sin,"—but that we may learn the humility of repentance, or else discover that even in such falls salvation ought not to be despaired of. For there are some who, when they have fallen into sin, perish rather from the recklessness of despair, and not only neglect the remedy of repentance, but become the slaves of lusts and wicked desires, so far as to run

all lengths in gratifying these depraved and abandoned dispositions,—as if it were a loss to them if they failed to accomplish what their lust impelled them to, whereas all the while there awaits them a certain condemnation. To oppose this morbid recklessness, which is only too full of danger and ruin, there is great force in the record of those sins into which even just and holy men have before now fallen.

CHAP. 41.—*Whether holy men have died without sin. Forgiveness of sins like a daily incense. No man can live, though he may die, without sin.*

But there is clearly much acuteness in the question put by our author, “How must we suppose that those holy men quitted this life,—with sin, or without sin?” For if we answer, “With sin,” condemnation will be supposed to have been their destiny, which it is shocking to imagine; but if it be said that they departed this life “without sin,” then it would be a proof that man had been without sin in his present life, at all events, when death was approaching. But, with all his acuteness, he overlooks the circumstance that even righteous persons not without good reason offer up this prayer: “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors;”¹ and that the Lord [Jesus] Christ, after explaining the prayer in His teaching, most truly added: “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your [heavenly] Father will also forgive you your trespasses.”² Here, indeed, we have the daily incense, so to speak, of the Spirit, which is offered to God on the altar of the heart, which we are bidden “to lift up [unto the Lord,]”—implying that, even if we cannot live here without sin, we may yet die without sin, whilst the sin is blotted out in merciful forgiveness which is committed in ignorance or infirmity.

CHAP. 42. [XXXVI.]—*The blessed Virgin Mary lived without sin. None of the saints besides her without sin. The praise of humility is not to be placed on the side of falsehood.*

He then enumerates those “who not only lived without sin, but are described as having led holy lives,—Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joshua the son of Nun, Phinehas, Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Joseph, Elisha, Micaiah, Daniel, Hananiah, Azariah, Mishaël, Mordecai, Simeon, Joseph

¹ Matt. vi. 12.

² Matt. vi. 14.

the husband of the Virgin Mary, and John." And he adds the names of some women,—“Deborah, Hannah the mother of Samuel, Judith, Esther, the other Anna, daughter of Phanuel, Elisabeth, and even the mother of our Lord and Saviour, for of her,” he says, “we must needs allow that her piety had no sin in it.” We must except the holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom I wish to raise no question, when it touches the subject of sins, out of honour to the Lord; for from Him we know what abundance of grace for overcoming sin in every particular was conferred upon her who had the merit to conceive and bear Him who undoubtedly had no sin. Well, then, if, with this exception of the Virgin, we could only assemble together all the forementioned holy men and women, and ask them whether they lived without sin whilst they were in this life, what can we suppose would be their answer? Would it be in the language of our author, or in the words of the Apostle John? I put it to you, whether, on having such a question submitted to them, however excellent might have been their sanctity in this body, they would not have exclaimed with one voice: “If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us?”¹ But perhaps in this their answer would have shown more of humility than of truth! Well, but our author has already determined, and rightly determined, “not to place the praise of humility on the side of falsehood.” If, therefore, they spoke the truth in giving such an answer, they would have sin, and since they humbly acknowledged it, the truth would be in them; but if they lied in their answer, they would still have sin, because the truth would not be in them.

CHAP. 43. [XXXVII.]

“But perhaps,” says he, “they will ask me: Could not the Scripture have mentioned some sins belonging to all of them?” And surely they would say the truth, whoever should put such a question to him; and I do not discover that he has anywhere given a sound reply to them, although I perceive that he was unwilling to let the question pass without an answer. What this is, I beg of you to observe:

¹ 1 John i. 8.

“This,” says he, “might be rightly asked of those whom Scripture mentions neither as good nor as bad; but of those whose holiness it mentions, it would also no doubt have mentioned the sins likewise, if only it had known that they had sinned at all.” He would say, forsooth, that their grand faith had no connection with holiness in the case of those who comprised “the multitudes that went before and that followed” the colt on which the Lord rode, when “they shouted and said, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord,”¹ even amidst the malignant men who with murmurs asked why they were doing all this! Let him then boldly tell us, if he can, that there was not a man in all that vast crowd who had any sin at all. Now, if it is most absurd to make such a statement as this, why has not the Scripture mentioned any sins in the persons to whom reference has been made, especially when it has carefully recorded the eminent goodness of their faith?

CHAP. 44.

This, however, even *he* probably observed, and therefore he went on to say: “But, granted that it has sometimes abstained, in the instance of a numerous crowd, from narrating the sins of all that composed it; still, in the very beginning of the world, when there were only four persons in existence, what reason (asks he) have we to give why it chose not to mention the sins of all [that small number?] Was it in consideration of the vast multitude, which had not yet come into existence? or because, having mentioned only the sins of those who had transgressed, it was unable to record any of him who had not yet committed sin?” And then he proceeds to add some words, in which he unfolds this idea with a fuller and more explicit illustration. “It is certain,” says he, “that in the earliest age Adam and Eve, and Cain and Abel their sons, are mentioned as being the only four persons then in being. Eve sinned,—the Scripture distinctly says so much; Adam also transgressed, as the same Scripture does not fail to inform us; whilst it affords us an equally clear testimony that Cain also sinned: and of

¹ Matt. xxi. 9.

all these it not only mentions the sins, but also indicates the character of their sins. Now if Abel had likewise sinned, Scripture would no doubt have told us so. But it has given us no such information; therefore he committed no sin, and not only so, but proved himself, and the Scripture moreover shows him, to have been a righteous man.¹ What we read, therefore, let us believe; and what we do not read, let us deem it impious to affirm."

CHAP. 45. [XXXVIII.]—*Why Cain has been by some thought to have had children by his mother Eve. The sins of righteous men. Who can be both righteous, and yet not without sin.*

When he says this, he forgets what he had himself said not long before: "After the human race had multiplied, it was possible that in the crowd the Scripture may have neglected to notice the sins of all men." If indeed he had borne this well in mind, he would have seen that even in one man there was such a crowd and so vast a number of slight sins, that it would have been impossible (or, even if possible, improper) to describe them. Those only are recorded which required some method and consideration to be applied in their selection, that they might serve, in their limited number, as examples for instructing the reader in the many cases where he needed warning. Scripture has indeed omitted to mention concerning the few persons who were then in existence, either their numbers or their characters,²—in other words, how many sons and daughters Adam and Eve begat, and what names they gave them; and from this circumstance some, not considering how many things are quietly passed over in Scripture, have gone so far as to suppose that Cain cohabited with his mother, and by her had the children which are mentioned, thinking that Adam's sons had no sisters, because Scripture failed to mention them in the particular place, although it afterwards, in the way of recapitulation, implied what it had previously omitted,—that "Adam begat sons and daughters,"³ without, however, dropping a syllable to intimate either their number or the time

¹ [We have thus combined the two possible meanings of "*quinetiam justum ostendit.*" See 1 John iii. 12.]

² Quot vel qui fuerint.

³ Gen. v. 4.

when they were born. In like manner it was unnecessary to state whether Abel, notwithstanding that he is rightly styled "righteous," ever indulged in immoderate laughter, or was ever jocose in moments of relaxation, or ever looked at an object with a covetous eye, or ever plucked fruit to extravagance, or ever suffered indigestion from too much eating, or ever in the midst of his prayers permitted his thoughts to wander, and call him away from the purpose of his devotion; and [much more uncalled for still was it to state] how frequently these and many other similar failings stealthily crept over his mind. And are not these failings *sins*, about which the apostle's precept gives us a general admonition that we should avoid and restrain them, when he says: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof?"¹ To escape from such an obedience, we have to struggle in a constant and daily conflict against unlawful and unseemly inclinations. Only let the eye be directed, or rather abandoned, to an object which it ought to avoid, and let the mischief strengthen and get the mastery, and adultery is consummated in the body, which is expedited in the heart only more quickly, as thought is more rapid than action, and there is no impediment to retard and delay it. They who in a great degree have curbed this sin, that is, this appetite of a vitiated affection, so as not to obey its desires, nor to "yield their members to it as instruments of unrighteousness,"² have fairly deserved to be called righteous persons, and this by the help of the grace of God. Since, however, sin often stole over them in very small matters, and when they were off their guard, they were both righteous, and at the same time not sinless. To conclude, even if there were yet in righteous Abel that love of God, whereby alone the righteous man has true holiness, to enable him to advance in holiness and to lay him under a moral obligation to such progress, still, in whatever degree he fell short therein, it came from his own fault. And who indeed can help thus falling short, until he come to that mighty power thereof, in which man's entire infirmity shall be swallowed up?

¹ Rom. vi. 12.

² Rom. vi. 13.

CHAP. 46. [XXXIX.]

It is, to be sure, a grand sentence with which he concluded this passage, when he says: "What we read, therefore, let us believe; and what we do not read, let us deem it impious to affirm,—which it is sufficient to remark also of every case." On the contrary, I for my part say that we ought not to believe even everything that we read, [and this I say] on the sanction of the apostle's advice: "Read all things; hold fast that which is good."¹ Nor is it an impious thing to affirm anything which we have not read; for it is in our power to affirm anything which we have *bonâ fide* experienced as witnesses, even if it so happens that we have not read about it. Perhaps he will say in reply: "When I said this, I was treating of the Holy Scriptures." Oh how I wish that he were never willing to affirm, I will not say anything but what he reads in the Scriptures, but in opposition to what he reads in them; that he would only faithfully and obediently hear that which is written there: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned;"² and that he would not weaken the grace of the great Physician,—all by his unwillingness to confess that human nature is vitiated! Oh how I wish that he would, as a Christian, read the sentence, "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;"³ and that he would not so uphold the capability of human nature, as to believe that man can possibly be saved by his own free will without that Name!

CHAP. 47. [XL.]—*For what Pelagius thought that Christ is necessary to us.*

Perhaps, however, he thinks the name of Christ to be necessary on this account, that by means of His gospel we may learn how we ought to live; but not that we may be also assisted by His grace, in order withal to lead good lives. Well, even this consideration should lead him at least to confess that there is a miserable darkness in the human mind, which knows how it ought to tame a lion, but knows not how to live. To know this, too, is it enough for us to

¹ 1 Thess. v. 21.² Rom. v. 12.³ Acts iv. 12.

have a free will and the law of nature? This is that word-wisdom, whereby "the cross of Christ is rendered of none effect."¹ He, however, who said, "I will destroy the wisdom of the prudent,"² since that cross cannot be made of none effect in very deed, overthrows the wisdom of the prudent by that foolishness of preaching whereby believers are healed [of their sinful malady.] For if natural capacity, by help of free will, is in itself sufficient both for discovering how one ought to live, and also for leading a holy life, then "Christ died in vain,"³ and therefore also "the offence of the cross is ceased."⁴ Why also may I not myself exclaim,—nay, I will exclaim, and chide them with a Christian's sorrow,— "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by nature; ye are fallen from grace;"⁵ for, "being ignorant of God's righteousness, and wishing to establish your own righteousness, you have not submitted yourselves to the righteousness of God?"⁶ For even as "Christ is the end of the law," so likewise is He the Saviour of man's corrupted nature, "for righteousness to every one that believeth."⁷

CHAP. 48. [XLI.]—*How the term "all" is to be understood.*

His opponents adduced the passage, "All have sinned,"⁸ and he met their statement founded on this with the remark that "the apostle was manifestly speaking of the then existing generation, that is, the Jews and the Gentiles;" but surely the passage which I have quoted, "By one man sin entered the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, in that all have sinned,"⁹ embraces in its terms the generations both of old and of modern times, both ourselves and our posterity. He quotes, "As by the offence of one, [judgment came] upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of One, [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life,"¹⁰ and thus remarks: "There can be no doubt that not all men are sanctified by the righteousness of Christ, but only those who are willing to obey Him, and have been cleansed in the washing of His baptism." Well,

¹ 1 Cor. i. 17.

² 1 Cor. i. 19.

³ Gal. ii. 21.

⁴ Gal. v. 11.

⁵ Gal. v. 4.

⁶ Rom. x. 3.

⁷ Rom. x. 4.

⁸ Rom. iii. 23.

⁹ Rom. v. 12.

¹⁰ Rom. v. 18.

but he does not prove what he wants by this quotation. For as the clause, "By the offence of one, [judgment came] upon all men to condemnation," is so worded that not one is omitted in its sense, so in the corresponding clause, "By the righteousness of one, [the free gift came] upon all men unto justification of life," there is a like fulness of meaning which omits none,—not, indeed, because all men have faith and are washed in His baptism, but because no man is justified unless he believes in Christ and is cleansed by His baptism. The term "*all*" is therefore used in a way which shows that no one whatever can be supposed able to be saved by any other means than through Christ Himself. For if in a city there be appointed but one instructor, we are most correct in saying: That man teaches all in that place; not meaning, indeed, that all who live in the city take lessons of him, but that no one is instructed unless taught by him. In like manner no one is justified unless Christ has justified him.¹

CHAP. 49. [XLII.].—*A man can be sinless, but only by the help of grace. In the saints this possibility advances and keeps pace with the realization.*

"Well, be it so," says he, "I agree; he testifies to the fact that all were sinners. He says, indeed, what they have been, not that they might not have been something else. Wherefore," he adds, "if all men could be proved to be sinners, it would not by any means prejudice our own definite position, in insisting not so much on what men are, as on what they are capable of being." He is right for once to allow that no man living is justified in God's sight. He contends, however, that this is not the question in the passage before us, but that the point lies in the possibility of a man's not sinning,—on which subject it is unnecessary even for ourselves to take ground against him; for, in truth, I do not much care about expressing a definite opinion on the question, whether in the present life there ever have been, or now are, or ever can be, any persons who have had, or are having, or are to have, the love of God so perfectly as to admit of no addition to it (for nothing short of this amounts to a most true, plenary, and perfect righteousness). The point which I aver and maintain concerns the ability of man's will,—what it can do when

¹ Compare *De Peccatorum meritis et remissione*, i. 55.

assisted by the grace of God. As to the incidental questions of time and place, and the person who is to accomplish the doing, I am not bound to bestow any great pains in discussing them. Nor do I indeed contend about the actual possibility, forasmuch as the possibility under dispute advances with the realization in all holy persons, their human will being duly healed and helped [by divine grace;] whilst "the love of God," as fully as our sound and cleansed nature can possibly receive it, "is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given to us."¹ In a better way, therefore, is God's cause promoted (and it is to its promotion that our author professes to apply his warm defence of nature) when He is acknowledged as our Saviour no less than as our Creator, than when His succour to us as Saviour is impaired and dwarfed to nothing by the defence of the creature, as if it were sound and its resources entire.

CHAP. 50. [XLIII.]—*God commands no impossibilities.*

What he says, however, is true enough, "that God is so good and just, that He made man of such a nature as to be quite able to live without the evil of sin, if indeed he had been only willing." For who does not know that man was made whole and faultless, and endowed with a free will and a power at liberty to lead a holy life? Our present inquiry, however, is about the man whom "the thieves"² left half dead on the road, and who, being disabled and pierced through with heavy wounds, is quite incapable of mounting up to the heights of holiness with the facility wherewith he was able to descend therefrom; who, moreover, is still in process of cure, even though he is already in "the inn."³ God therefore does not enjoin impossibilities; but in His injunctions He counsels you both to do what you can for yourself, and to ask His aid in what you cannot do. Now, we should see whence comes the possibility, and whence the impossibility. He says: "That proceeds not from a man's will which he can do by nature." I say: A man is not righteous by his will if he can be by nature. He will, however, be able to accomplish

¹ Rom. v. 5.

² Luke x. 30. [Rather, "robbers;" *latrones, λησται.*]

³ Luke x. 34.

by remedial aid what he is rendered incapable of doing by the fault [of his nature.]

CHAP. 51. [XLIV.]—*State of the question between the Pelagians and the Catholics. Holy men of old saved by the self-same faith in Christ which we exercise.*

But why need we tarry longer on general statements? Let us go into the core of the question, which we have to discuss with our opponents solely, or almost entirely, on one particular point. For inasmuch as he says that “as far as the present question is concerned, it is not pertinent to inquire whether there have been or now are any men in this life without sin, but whether there could ever have been or still could be such persons;” so, were I even to allow that there have been or are any such, I should not by any means therefore affirm the past or the present possibility [of any men being sinless,] unless justified by the grace of God through our Lord “Jesus Christ and Him crucified.”¹ For the same faith which healed the saints of old now heals us,—that is to say, faith “in the one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,”²—faith in His blood, faith in His cross, faith in His death and resurrection. As we therefore have the same spirit of faith, we also believe, and on that account also speak.

CHAP. 52.

Let us, however, observe what our author answers, after laying before himself the question wherein he seems indeed so intolerable to Christian hearts. He says: “But you will tell me this is what moves a great many,—the fact that you do not maintain that it is by the grace of God that a man can be without sin.” Certainly this is what causes us disturbance; this is what we object to him. He touches the very gist of the case. This is what causes us such utter pain to endure it; this is why we cannot bear to have such points debated by Christians, owing to the love which we feel towards others and towards themselves. Well, let us hear how he clears himself from the objectionable character of the question he has raised. “What blindness of ignorance,” he exclaims, “what sluggishness of an uninstructed mind, which supposes that that is maintained and held to be without God’s grace

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 2.

² 1 Tim. ii. 5.

which it merely hears ought to be attributed to God!" Now, if we knew nothing of what follows this outburst of his, and formed our opinion on simply hearing these words, we might suppose that we had been led to a wrong view of our opponents by the recklessness of report and by the asseveration of some competent witnesses among the brethren. For how could it have been more pointedly and truly stated that the possibility of men's not sinning, to whatever extent it exists or shall exist, ought only to be attributed to [the grace of] God? This too is our own affirmation. We may shake hands.

CHAP. 53. [XLV.]

Well, must we listen to the rest of the sentence? Yes, certainly; both hear it, and of course correct it and guard against it. These are his words: "Now, when it is said that the very possibility in dispute is not at all within the competence of man's will, but of the Author of nature,—that is, God,—how can that possibly be understood to be without the grace of God which is deemed to belong to Him in so especial a manner?" Here we begin to see what he means; but that we may not lie under any mistake, he explains himself with greater breadth and clearness: "That this may become still plainer, we must," says he, "enter on a somewhat fuller discussion of the point. Now we affirm that the possibility of anything lies not so much in the power of a man's will as in the necessity of nature." He then proceeds to illustrate his meaning by examples and similes. "Take," says he, "for instance, my ability to speak. That I am able to speak is not my own; but that I do speak is my own,—that is, it proceeds from my own will. And because the act of my speaking is my own, I have the power of resorting to either alternative,—that is to say, I am able either to speak or to refrain from speaking. But as my being able to speak is not my own,—in other words, does not proceed from my own will and pleasure,—this capability of speech at all times is a matter of necessity,¹ [not of volition,] to me; and if I wished to be unable to

¹ *Necesse est me semper loqui posse.* This obscure sentence seems to point to Pelagius' former statement: *Cujusque rei possibilitatem non tam in arbitrii humani potestate quàm in naturæ necessitate consistere.*

speaking, I still have no power to secure such inability to myself, unless perhaps I were to deprive myself of that member whereby the function of speaking is to be performed." Many means, indeed, might be mentioned whereby, if he wish it, a man may deprive himself of the ability to speak, without removing the organ of speech. If, for instance, anything were to happen to a man to destroy his voice, he would be unable to speak, although the proper organ remained; for a man's voice is of course no organic part of his body. There may, in short, be an injury done to the organ internally, short of the actual loss of it. I am, however, unwilling to press the argument for a word; and it may be replied to me in the contest, Why, even to injure [an organ of our body] is to lose the use of it. But yet we can so contrive matters, by closing and shutting the mouth with bandages, as to be quite unable to open it, and, [what is more,] to put the opening of it out of our power, although it was quite in our own competency to shut it while the strength and healthy exercise of the limbs remained.

CHAP. 54. [XLVI.]—*There is no incompatibility between necessity and the freedom of our will.*

Now how does all this apply to our subject? Let us see what he makes out of it. "Whatever," says he, "is bound by natural necessity is deprived of all freedom of will and deliberate choice." Well, now, here lies a question; for it is the height of absurdity for us to say that it is no concern of our will when we form a wish to be happy, on the ground that it is absolutely impossible for us to be unwilling to be happy, by reason of some indescribable but amiable coercion of our nature; nor dare we maintain that God wills not to be holy, but is under the necessity of being so, because He cannot be willing to sin.

CHAP. 55. [XLVII.]

Mark also what follows. "We may perceive," says he, "the same thing to be true of hearing, smelling, and seeing,—that to hear, and to smell, and to see is our own, while the capacity to hear, and to smell, and to see is not our own, but lies in a natural necessity." Either I do not understand what he means, or he does not himself. For how is the capacity to see

not in our own power, if the necessity of not seeing is in our own power; because blindness is in our own power, by which we can deprive ourselves, if we will, of this very capacity to see? How, moreover, is it in our own power to see whenever we will, when, without any loss whatever to our natural structure of body in the organ of sight, we are unable, even though we wish, to see,—either by the removal of all external lights during the night, or by our being shut up in some dark place? Likewise, if our capacity or our incapacity to hear is not in our own power, but lies in the necessity of nature, whereas our actual hearing or not hearing is within the competency of our own will, how comes it that he is inattentive to the fact that there are so many things which we hear against our will, which penetrate our sense even when our ears are stopped, as the creaking of a saw near to us, or the grunt of a pig? Although the said stopping of our ears shows plainly enough that it does not lie within our own power not to hear with open ears; perhaps, too, such a stopping of our ears as shall deprive us of the entire sense in question proves that even the ability not to hear lies within our own power. As to his remarks, again, concerning our sense of smell, does he not display no little carelessness when he says “that it is not in our own power to be able or to be unable to smell, but that it is in our own power”—that is to say, it lies within the competency of our own will—“to smell or not to smell?” For let us suppose some one to place us, with our hands firmly tied, but yet without any injury to our olfactory organs, among some bad and noxious smells; in such a case we altogether lose the power, however strong may be our wish not to smell, because every time we are obliged to draw breath, we also inhale the smell which we dislike.

CHAP. 56. [XLVIII.]—*The assistance of grace in a perfect nature.*

Not only, then, are these similes employed by our author false, but the application also which he has made of them is equally incorrect. He goes on to say: “In like manner, touching the possibility of our not sinning, we must understand that it is ours not to sin, but yet that the ability to avoid sin is not ours.” If he were speaking of man’s whole and perfect nature, which we do not yet possess,—“for we are

saved by hope : but hope that is seen is not hope : [for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?] But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it,"¹—his language even in that case would not be correct, to the effect that (however true it might be that it would be in our power to sin) to avoid sinning would be simply in our own control ; for even then there must be the help of God, which must shed itself on those who are willing to receive it, just as the light is given to strong and healthy eyes to assist them in their function of sight. Inasmuch, however, as it is about this present life of ours that he raises the question, wherein our corruptible body weighs down the soul, and our earthly tabernacle depresses our sense with all its many thoughts, I am astonished that he can with any heart suppose that, even without the help of our Saviour's healing balm, it is in our own power to avoid sin, and at the same time ascribe the capacity to do so to nature, which gives only stronger evidence of its own vitiated state by the very fact of its failing to see its taint.

CHAP. 57. [XLIX.]—*It does not detract from God's almighty power, that He is incapable of either sinning, or dying, or destroying Himself.*

"Inasmuch," says he, "as not to sin is ours, [it follows that] we are able to sin and to avoid sin." What, then, if another should say : Because it belongs to us not to wish for unhappiness, [it follows that] we are able both to wish for it and not to wish for it ; while yet we are positively unable to wish for it ? For who could possibly wish to be unhappy, even if he wishes for something else from which unhappiness would ensue to him even against his will ? Then again, since, in an infinitely greater degree, it appertains to God not to sin, shall we therefore venture to say that He is able both to sin and to avoid sin ? God forbid that we should ever say that He is able to sin ! For He cannot, as foolish persons suppose, therefore fail to be almighty, because He is unable to die, or because He cannot deny Himself. What, therefore, does he mean ? by what method of speech does he try to persuade us on a point which he is himself loth to consider ? For he advances a step further, and says : "Since indeed it does not appertain to us to be able to avoid sin, even if we were to wish

¹ Rom. viii. 24, 25.

not to be able to avoid sin, it is not in our power to be unable to avoid sin." It is an involved sentence, and therefore a very obscure one. It might, however, be more plainly expressed in some such way as this: Since to be able to avoid sin does not appertain to us, then, whether it be with our will or without our will, we are able to avoid sin! He does not say, whether with our will or without our will, we do not sin,—for we undoubtedly do sin, if we will,—but yet he asserts that, whether we will or not, we have the capacity of not sinning,—a capacity which he declares to be inherent in our nature. Of a man, indeed, who has his legs strong and sound, it may be said admissibly enough, that whether he will or not he has the power or capacity of walking; but if his legs be broken, he has not the capacity or ability, however much he may wish to walk. The nature of which our author speaks is vitiated. "Why is earth and ashes proud?"¹ It is vitiated, [I say.] It implores the Physician's help. "Save me, O Lord,"² is its cry; "Heal my soul,"³ it exclaims. Why does he check such cries so as to hinder future health, by insisting as it were on its present possibility?

CHAP. 58. [L.]—*Even pious and God-fearing men resist grace.*

Observe also what remark he adds, by which he thinks that his position is confirmed: "No effort of will," says he, "can take away that which is proved to be inseparably implanted in nature." Whence then comes that utterance: "So then ye cannot do the things that ye would?"⁴ Whence also this: "For what good I would, that I do not; but what evil I hate, that do I?"⁵ Where is that capability which is proved to be so inseparably implanted in nature? See, it is human beings who do not what they will; and it is about not sinning that he was treating, of course,—not about not flying, because it was men, not birds, that formed his subject. Behold, it is man who does not the good which he would, but does the evil which he hates: "to will is present with him, but how to perform that which is good he finds himself unable."⁶ Where, [I ask again,] is the capability which is shown to be so inseparably inherent in nature? It is certain that the

¹ Eccclus. x. 9.

² Ps. xii. 1.

³ Ps. xli. 4.

⁴ Gal. v. 17.

⁵ Rom. vii. 15.

⁶ Rom. vii. 18.

apostle does not speak of his own mere self, but to his own person attributes a general character, man being the object thus assumed by him. By our author, however, it is maintained that our human nature actually possesses as an inseparable attribute the capacity of not sinning. Such a statement, however, even when made by a man who knows not the effect of his words (but this ignorance is hardly attributable to the man who suggests the propriety of such statements even for unwary, though God-fearing men), causes the grace of Christ to be "made of none effect,"¹ when it is pretended that human nature is self-sufficient for its own holiness and justification.

CHAP. 59. [LI.]—*In what sense Pelagius attributed to God's grace the capacity of not sinning.*

In order, however, to escape from the odium which arises in consequence of the jealousy wherewith Christians guard everything affecting their salvation, he parries their question when they ask him, "Why do you affirm that man without the help of God's grace is able to avoid sin?" by saying, "The actual capability of not sinning lies not so much in the power of man's will as in the necessity of his nature. Now, whatever is placed in the necessity of nature undoubtedly appertains to the Author of that nature, that is, God. How then," says he, "can that be regarded as done without the grace of God which is shown to belong in an especial manner to God?" We have here expressed the opinion which all along was kept in the background; there is, in fact, no way of permanently concealing such a doctrine. The reason why he attributes to the grace of God the capacity of not sinning is, that God is the Author of that nature in which he declares this capacity of avoiding sin to be inseparably inherent. Whenever *He* wills a thing, no doubt He does it; and what He wills not, that He does not. Now, wherever there is this inseparable capability, there cannot accrue any infirmity of the will; or rather, there cannot be both a readiness of the will and a failure in the "performance."² This, then, being the case, how comes it to pass that "to will is present, where how to perform that

¹ 1 Cor. i. 17. Another reading has *crux Christi* instead of "Christi gratia," thus closely adopting the apostle's words.

² Rom. vii. 18.

which is good" is absent? Now, if the author of the work we are discussing spoke of that nature of man, which was in the beginning created faultless and perfect, in whatever sense his dictum be taken, "that it has an inseparable capacity,"—that is, so to say, a capability which cannot be lost,—then that nature ought not to have been mentioned at all which admitted of deterioration, and which could require a physician to restore sight to the blind, and that possibility of seeing which had been lost through blindness;—for I suppose a blind man would like to see, but is unable. Now, whenever a man wishes to do a thing and cannot, there is present to him the will, but he has lost the capability.

CHAP. 60. [LII.]

See what obstacles he still attempts to break through, if possible, in order to introduce his own opinion. He raises a question for himself in these terms: "But you will tell me that, according to the apostle, the flesh is contrary¹ to us;" and then answers it in this wise: "How can it be that in the case of any baptized person the flesh is contrary to him, when according to the same apostle he is understood not to be in the flesh? For he says, 'But ye are not in the flesh.'"² Very well; we shall soon see³ whether it be really true that [the apostle] says that in the baptized the flesh cannot be contrary to them; at present, however, as it was impossible for him quite to forget that he was a Christian (although his reminiscence on the point is but slight), he has quitted his defence of nature. Where then is that inseparable capability of his? Does he mean that those who are not yet baptized are not a part of human nature? Well, now, here by all means, here at this point, he might find his opportunity of awaking out of his sleep; and he still has it if he is careful. "How can it be," he asks, "that in the case of a baptized person the flesh is contrary to him?" Then [it seems] to the unbaptized the flesh is contrary. Let him tell us how, because even in the case of these the resources of nature have been stoutly maintained by him. However, in these he does allow that nature is vitiated, inasmuch as it was actually

¹ Gal. v. 17.² Rom. viii. 9.³ In the next chapter.

among the already baptized that the wounded traveller left his inn sound and well, or rather remains sound in the inn whither the compassionate Samaritan carried him that he might become cured.¹ Well, now, if he allows the contrariety of the flesh even in these, let him tell us what has happened to occasion this, since the flesh and the spirit alike are the work of one and the same Creator, and are therefore both of them good, because *He* is good. What indeed is it except the flaw which has been inflicted by man's own wilfulness? And that this fault of our nature may be repaired, there is need of that very Saviour from whose creative hand nature itself proceeded. Now, if we acknowledge that this Saviour, and that healing remedy of His which made the Word incarnate in order to dwell within us, are required by small and great,—by the crying infant and the hoary-headed man alike,—then, in fact, the whole controversy of the point between us is settled at once and for ever.

CHAP. 61. [LIII.]

Now let us see whether we anywhere read about the flesh being contrary in the baptized also. And here, I ask, to whom did the apostle say, "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would?"² He wrote this, I apprehend, to the Galatians, to whom he also says, "He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith?"³ It appears, therefore, that it is to Christians that he speaks, to whom God had also given His Spirit: then it is to the baptized [that these words are addressed.] Observe, therefore, that even in baptized persons the flesh is found to be contrary; so that they cannot have that capacity about which our author speaks as if it were inseparably inherent in our nature. Where then is the ground for his assertion, "How can it be that in the case of a baptized person the flesh is contrary to him?" in whatever sense he understands the flesh? Because in very deed it is not the nature of the flesh, which is good, [that is thought

¹ Luke x. 34.² Gal. v. 17.³ Gal. iii. 5.

of:] but it is the carnal faults of the flesh which are expressly named in the passage before us.¹ Yet observe, even in the baptized, how contrary is the flesh. And in what way contrary? "They do not the things which they would." Take notice that the will is present in a man; but where is that capacity of nature [of which we hear so much?] Let us confess that grace is necessary to us; let us cry out, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" And let our answer be, [as his of old was,] "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord!"²

CHAP. 62.—*Concerning what grace of God the discussion is here concerned. The ungodly man, when dying, is not delivered from concupiscence.*

Now, whereas there is the greatest correctness in those words of the question put to him, "Why do you affirm that man without the help of God's grace is able to avoid sin?" yet the inquiry did not concern that grace of God by which man was created, but only that whereby he is saved through Jesus Christ our Lord. Faithful men say in their prayer, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."³ But if they already have [the boasted] capacity of avoiding the evil, why do they thus pray for it? Or, what is the evil which they pray to be delivered from, but, above all else, "the body of this death?" And from this only God's grace delivers them, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Not indeed from this bodily substance of us, which is very good; but from its carnal lusts, whence a man is only liberated by the grace of the Saviour,—and not when he quits the body by the death thereof. If the apostle meant [only] to declare this, why had he previously said, "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members?"⁴ Behold what damage the disobedience of the will has inflicted on man's nature! He may be permitted to pray that he may be healed. But why does he presume so strongly on the capability of his nature? It is wounded, hurt, harassed, destroyed. It is a true confession of its weakness, not a false defence of its capacity, that it stands in need of. It

¹ See the context of Gal. v. 17, in verses 19–21.

² Rom. vii. 24, 25.

³ Matt. vi. 13.

⁴ Rom. vii. 23.

requires the grace of God, not that it may be made, but that it may be re-made. And this is the only grace which by our author is declared to be unnecessary; and the more loudly so declared, because of the silence he keeps about it. If, indeed, he had said nothing at all about God's grace, and had not proposed to himself that question for solution, for the purpose of removing from himself the odium of this matter,¹ it might have been thought that his view of the subject was consistent with the truth, only that he had refrained from mentioning it, on the ground that not on all occasions must we say all we think. He proposed, [however,] the question of grace, and answered it in the way that suited him; it has [therefore] assumed its distinctive form, not in the way we wished, but according to the doubt we entertained as to what was his meaning.

CHAP. 63. [LIV.]

He next endeavours, by much quotation from the apostle, about which there is no controversy, to show "that the flesh is often mentioned by him in such a manner as proves him to mean not the substance, but the works of the flesh." What is this to the point? The faults of the flesh are contrary to the will of man. His nature is not accused, but a Physician is wanted for its defects. What signifies his question, "Who made man's spirit?" and his own answer thereto, "God, without a doubt?" Again he asks, "Who created the flesh?" and again answers, "The same God, I suppose." And yet a third question, "Is the God good who created both?" and the third answer, "Nobody doubts it." Once more a question, "Are not both good, since the good Creator made them?" and its answer, "It must be confessed that they are." And then follows his conclusion: "Since, therefore, the spirit [of man] is good, and his flesh good, as made by the good Creator, how can it be that the two being good should be contrary to one another?" I need not say that the whole of this reasoning would be upset if one were to ask him, "Who made heat and cold?" and he were to say in answer, "God, without a doubt." For my part, I decline asking a string of questions on the point. Let him determine himself whether these conditions of climate may

¹ See above, ch. 59, *sub init.*

either be said to be not good, or else whether they do not seem to be contrary to each other. Here he will probably object, "These are not substances, but the qualities of substances." Very true, it is so. But still they are natural qualities, and undoubtedly belong to God's creation; and substances, indeed, are not said to be contrary to each other in themselves, but in their qualities, as water and fire. What if it be so too with flesh and spirit? We do not affirm it to be so; but, in order to show that his argument terminates in a conclusion which does not necessarily follow, we have said so much as this: That it is quite possible for contraries not to be reciprocally opposed to each other, but rather by mutual action to temper health and render it good. Thus, in the case of our body, dryness and moisture, cold and heat, are substances in the tempering of which altogether consists our bodily health. The fact, however, that "the flesh is contrary to the Spirit, so that we cannot do the things that we would,"¹ is a defect, not a natural state. The Physician's grace must be sought, and the controversy must end.

CHAP. 64.

Now, as touching these two good substances which the good God created, how, in the case of unbaptized persons, can it be true of them that they are contrary the one to the other, as this man's reasoning would make them to be? Will he be sorry to have said this too, which he admitted out of some regard to the Christians' faith? For when he asked, "How, in the case of any person who is already baptized, could there be a contrariousness in his flesh?" he intimated, of course, that in the case of unbaptized persons it is possible for the flesh to be contrary. For why insert the clause, "*who is already baptized*," when without such an addition he might have put his question thus: "How in the case of any person can the flesh be contrary?" and when, in order to prove this, he might have subjoined that argument of his, that as both body and spirit are good (made as they are by the good Creator), they therefore cannot be contrary to each other? Now, suppose unbaptized persons (in whom, at any rate, he holds the contrariousness of the flesh) were to ply him with

¹ Gal. v. 17.

his own arguments, and say to him, Who made man's spirit? he must answer, God. Suppose they asked him again, Who created the flesh? and he answers, The same God, I apprehend. Suppose their third question to be, Is the God good who created both? and his reply to be, Nobody doubts it. Suppose once more they put to him his yet remaining inquiry, Are not both good, since the good Creator made them? and his acknowledgment of that truth;—then surely “they will hoist the engineer with his own petard,” when they force home his conclusion on him, and say: Since therefore the spirit of man is good, and his flesh good, as made by the good Creator, how can it be that the two being good should be contrary to one another? Here, perhaps, he will reply: I beg your pardon, I ought not to have said that the flesh cannot be contrary to the spirit in any baptized person, as if I meant to imply that it is contrary in the unbaptized; but I ought to have made my statement general, to the effect that the flesh in no man's case is contrary. Now see into what a corner he drives himself. See what a man will say, who is unwilling to cry out with the apostle, “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.”¹ “But why,” he asks “should I so exclaim, who am already baptized in Christ? It is for them to cry out thus who have not yet received so great a benefit, whose words the apostle in a figure transferred to himself,—if indeed even they say so much.” Well, so intense is this man's defence of nature, that it does not permit even these to utter this exclamation. For in the baptized, nature does not exist; nor in the unbaptized is there nature. Or if even in the one class it is allowed to be vitiated, so that it is not without reason that men exclaim, “O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?” and to the other help is brought in what follows: “I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord,” let it at last be granted that human nature stands in need of Christ for its Physician.

CHAP. 65. [LV.]—“*This body of death,*” so called from its defect, not from its substance.

Now, I ask, when did our nature lose that liberty, which

¹ Rom. vii. 24, 25.

he craves to be given to him when he says: "Who shall deliver me?" For even he finds no fault with the substance of the flesh when he expresses his desire to be liberated from the body of this death, for he affirms that the nature of the body, as well as of the soul, must be attributed to the good God as the author thereof. What he speaks of undoubtedly concerns the sins of the body. Now from our body the death of the body separates us; whereas the vices contracted from the body remain, and their just punishment awaits them, as the rich man [in the parable] found to his cost in hell.¹ From these it was that he was unable to deliver himself, who said: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"² But whensoever it was that he lost the liberty in question, at least there remains that capability which is inseparable from nature. This power he has from the resources of nature, whilst the will comes to him through the freedom of his volition. [Then if this be so,] why does he require the sacrament of baptism? Is it because of past sins, in order that they may be forgiven, since they cannot be undone? Well, suppose you acquit and release a man on these terms, he must still utter the old cry; for he not only wants to be mercifully let off from punishment for past offences, but to be strengthened and fortified against sinning for the time to come. For he "delights in the law of God, after the inward man; but then he sees another law in his members, warring against the law of his mind."³ Observe, he sees that there *is*, not recollects that there *was*. It is a present pressure, not a past memory. And he sees the other law not only "warring," but even "bringing him into captivity to the law of sin, which *is*" (not which *was*) "in his members."⁴ Hence comes that cry of his: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"⁵ Let him pray, let him entreat for the help of the mighty Physician. Why gainsay that prayer? Why cry down that entreaty? Why shall the unhappy suitor be hindered from begging for the mercy of Christ,—and that too by Christians? For, [alas!] it was even they who were accompanying Christ that tried

¹ Luke xvi. 23.² Rom. vii. 24.³ Rom. vii. 22, 23.⁴ Rom. vii. 23.⁵ Rom. vii. 24.

to prevent the blind man, by clamouring him down, from begging for light; but even amidst the din and throng of the gainsayers *He* hears the suppliant;¹ whence the invariable response: "I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord."²

CHAP. 66. [LVI.]

Now if we secure even this concession from them, that unbaptized persons implore the assistance of the Saviour's grace, this is indeed no slight point against that fallacious assertion of the self-sufficiency of nature and of the power of our free will [of which we hear so much.] For he has no self-sufficient resources who says, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" Nor can he be said to have full liberty who still asks for deliverance. But let us, moreover, see to this point also, whether they who are baptized do the good which they would, without any resistance from the lust of the flesh. That, however, which we have to say on this subject, our author himself mentions, when concluding this topic he says: "As we remarked, the passage in which occur the words, 'The flesh lusteth against the Spirit,'³ must needs have reference not to the substance, but to the works of the flesh." We too allege that this is spoken not of the substance of the flesh, but of its works, which proceed from carnal concupiscence,—in a word, from sin, concerning which we have this precept: "Not to let it reign in our mortal body, that we should obey it in the lusts thereof."⁴

CHAP. 67. [LVII.]—*Who may be said to be under the law.*

But even he should observe that it is to persons who have been already baptized that it was said: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."⁵ And lest he should make them disinclined for the actual conflict through sloth, and should seem by this statement to have given them laxity in sinning, he goes on to tell them: "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law."⁶ For that man is under the law, who, from fear of the punishment which the law

¹ Mark x. 46-52.² Rom. vii. 25.³ Gal. v. 17.⁴ Rom. vi. 12.⁵ Gal. v. 17.⁶ Gal. v. 18.

threatens, and not from any love for holiness, obliges himself to avoid the work of sin, without being as yet free and removed from the desire of sinning. For it is in his very will that he is guilty, whereby he would prefer, if it were possible, that [the punishment] he dreads should not exist, in order that he might freely do what he secretly desires. Therefore he says, "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law,"—even the law which inspires fear, but gives not love. For this "love is shed abroad in our hearts," not by the letter of the law, but "by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us."¹ This is the law of liberty, not of bondage; being the law of love, not of fear; and concerning it the Apostle James says: "Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty,"² etc. Whence he no longer indeed felt terrified by God's law as a slave, but delighted in it in the inward man, although still seeing another law in his members warring against the law of his mind. Accordingly he here says: "If ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law." So far, indeed, as any man is led by the Spirit, he is not under the law; because, so far as he rejoices in the law of God, he lives not in fear of the law, since "fear has torment,"³ not joy and delight.

CHAP. 68. [LVIII.]

If, therefore, we feel rightly on this matter, it is our duty at once to be thankful for what is already healed within us, and to pray for such further healing as shall enable us to enjoy full liberty, in that most absolute state of health which is incapable of addition, the perfect pleasure at God's [right hand.]⁴ For we do not deny that human nature may be without sin; nor ought we by any means to refuse to it the power of perfectibility, since we admit its capacity for progress,—by God's grace, however, through our Lord Jesus Christ. By His assistance we aver that it becomes holy and happy, by whom it was created in order to be so. There is accordingly an easy refutation of the objection which our author says is alleged by some against him: "The devil is our adversary." This objection we also meet in entirely identical language with that which he uses in reply: "We must resist him, and he will flee. 'Resist the devil,' says the blessed

¹ Rom. v. 5.

² Jas. i. 25.

³ 1 John iv. 18.

⁴ Ps. xvi. 11.

apostle, 'and he will flee from you.'¹ From which it may be observed, what his harming amounts to against those whom he avoids; or what power he is to be understood as possessing, when he prevails only against those who do not resist him." Such language is my own also; for it is impossible to employ truer words. There is, however, this difference between us and his partisans, that we, whenever the devil has to be resisted, not only do not deny, but actually teach, that God's help must be sought; whereas they attribute so much power to the human will, as to exempt prayer from religious duty. Now it is certainly with a view to resisting the devil and his fleeing from us that we say when we pray, "Lead us not into temptation;"² to the same end also are we warned by our Captain, exhorting us as soldiers in the words: "Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation."³

CHAP. 69. [LIX.]

In opposition, however, to those who ask, "And who would be unwilling to be without sin, if it were put in the power of a man?" he discusses the question with perfect propriety, saying "that by this very question they acknowledge that the thing is not impossible; because so much as this, many, if not all men, certainly desire." Well, then, let him only confess the means by which this is possible, and then our controversy is ended. Now the means is the actual grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ; but nowhere has he been willing to allow that we are assisted at all by it in our prayers for the avoidance of sin. If indeed he happens to have secret views different from his expressed opinion, he must forgive us if we suspect otherwise. For he himself does no less than this, who, though encountering so much obloquy on this subject, wishes to entertain the secret opinion, and yet is unwilling to confess or profess it. It would surely be no great matter were he to speak out, especially since he has undertaken to handle and open this point, as if it had been objected against him on the side of opponents. Why on such occasions did he choose only to defend nature, and assert that man was so created as to have it in his power not to sin if he had not

¹ Jas. iv. 17.² Matt. vi. 13.³ Mark xiv. 38.

wished to sin; and, from the fact that he was so created, definitively say that the power was owing to God's grace which enabled him to avoid sin, if he was unwilling to commit it; and yet, [after all these admissions,] refuse to say anything concerning the fact that even nature itself is either, because disordered, healed by God's grace through our Lord Jesus Christ, or else assisted by it, because in itself it is so insufficient?

CHAP. 70. [LX.]—*Whether any man is without sin in this life.*

Now, whether there ever has been, or is, or ever can be, a man living so righteous a life in this world as to have no sin at all, may be an open question among true and pious Christians;¹ but if any person doubts the possibility of this sinless state *after this present life*, he is unwise. For my own part, indeed, I am unwilling to dispute the point even as respects this life. For although that passage seems to me to be incapable of bearing any doubtful sense, wherein it is written, "In thy sight shall no man living be justified"² (and so of similar passages), yet I can only wish it were possible to show either that such quotations were capable of bearing a better signification, or that a perfect and plenary righteousness, to which it were impossible for any accession to be made, had ever at any former time existed in any man whilst passing through this life in the flesh, or was now existing, or would hereafter come into existence. They, however, are in a great majority, who, while not doubting that to the last day of their life it will be needful to them to resort to the prayer which they can so truthfully utter, "Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us,"³ still trust that in Christ and His promises they possess a true, certain, and unfailling hope. There is, however, no method whereby any persons arrive at absolute perfection, or whereby any man makes the slightest progress to true and godly righteousness, but the assisting grace of our crucified Saviour Christ, and the gift of His Spirit; and whosoever shall deny this cannot rightly, I almost think, be reckoned in the number of any Christians at all.

¹ See next treatise—its preface, or *Admonitio*.

² Ps. cxliii. 2.

³ Matt. vi. 12.

CHAP. 71. [LXI.]—*Augustine replies against the quotations which Pelagius had advanced out of the Catholic writers.*

Accordingly, with respect even to the passages which he has adduced,—not indeed from the canonical Scriptures, but out of certain treatises of Catholic writers,—I wish to meet the assertions of such as say that the said quotations make for him. The fact is, these passages are so entirely neutral, that they oppose neither our own opinion nor his. Amongst them he wanted to class something out of my own books, thus accounting me to be a person who seemed worthy of being ranked with [the distinguished writers in question.] For this I must not be ungrateful, and I should be sorry—so I say with unaffected friendliness—for him to be in error, since he has conferred this honour upon me. As for his first quotation, indeed, why need I examine it largely, since I nowhere have discovered the author's name, either because he has not given it, or because from some casual mistake the copy which you¹ forwarded to me did not contain it? Especially as in writings of such authors I feel myself free to use my own judgment (owing unhesitating assent to nothing but the canonical Scriptures), whilst in fact there is not a passage which he has quoted from the works of this—so far as I can find—anonymous author² that disturbs me. “It was right,” says he, “for the Master and Teacher of virtue to become entirely like man, that by conquering sin He might show that man is able to overcome sin.” Now, whatever be the literal expression of this passage, its author must see to it as to what explanation it is capable of bearing. We, indeed, on our part, could not possibly doubt that in Christ there was no sin to conquer,—born as He was in *the likeness* of sinful flesh, not in sinful flesh itself. Another passage is adduced by our author to this effect: “And again, that by subduing the desires of the flesh He might teach us that it is not of necessity that one sins, but of set purpose and wilfulness.”³ For my own part, I understand these desires of the flesh (since it is not of its unlawful lusts that the writer

¹ Timasius and Jacobus.

² Lactantius is the writer from whom Pelagius takes his first quotations here. See his *Instit. Divin.* iv. 14.

³ Lactantius, *Instit. Divin.* iv. 5.

here speaks) to be such as hunger, thirst, refreshment after fatigue, and the like. For it is through these, however faultless they be in themselves, that some men fall into sin,—a result which never befell our blessed Saviour, even though, as we see from the evidence of the gospel, these affections were natural to Him owing to His likeness to sinful flesh.

CHAP. 72. [LXII.]—*The pure in heart blessed. The doing and perfecting of righteousness.*

He quotes the following words from the blessed Hilary: "It is only when we shall be perfect in spirit, and changed in our immortal state, which blessedness has been appointed only for the pure in heart,¹ that we shall see that which is immortal in God."² Now I am really not aware what is here said contrary to our own statement, or in what respect this passage is of any use to our opponent, unless it be that it testifies to the possibility of a man's being "pure in heart." But who denies such possibility? Only it must be through Jesus Christ our Lord, and not merely by our freedom of the will. He goes on to quote also this passage: "This Job had so effectually read, that he kept himself from every wicked work, because he worshipped God purely with a mind un-mixed with vices: now such worship of God is the proper work of righteousness." It is what Job had done which the writer here spoke of, not what he had brought to perfection in this world,—much less what he had done or perfected without the grace of that Saviour whom he had actually foretold.³ For that man, indeed, abstains from every wicked work, who does not allow the sin which he has within him to have dominion over him; and who, whenever an unworthy thought stole over him, suffered it not to come to a head in actual deed. It is, however, one thing not to have sin, and another to refuse obedience to its desires. It is one thing to fulfil the command, "Thou shalt not covet;"⁴ and another thing, by an endeavour at any rate after abstinence, to do that which is also written, "Thou shalt not go after thy lusts."⁵ And yet one is quite aware that he can do nothing of all this without the Saviour's grace. To work righteousness, therefore,

¹ See Matt. v. 8.

² Hilary *in loco*.

³ Job xix. 25.

⁴ Ex. xx. 17.

⁵ Eccclus. xviii. 30.

[is consistent with] having to fight in an internal struggle with the internal evil of concupiscence in the true worship of God; whilst to perfect it means to have no adversary at all. Now he who has to fight is still in danger, and is sometimes shaken, even if he is not overthrown; whereas he who has no enemy at all rejoices in perfect peace. He, moreover, is most truly said to be without sin in whom no sin has an indwelling,—not he who, abstaining from evil deeds, uses such language as [the apostle's:] “Now it is no longer I that do it, but the sin that dwelleth in me.”¹

CHAP. 73.—*He meets Pelagius with another passage from Hilary on Ps. cxix. 21.*

Now even Job himself is not silent respecting his own sins; and your friend,² of course, is justly of opinion that humility must not by any means be put on the side of falsehood and affectation. Whatever confession [of sin,] therefore, Job makes, inasmuch as he is a true worshipper of God, he undoubtedly makes it in sincerity and truth.³ Hilary, likewise, while expounding that passage of the psalm in which it is written, “Thou hast despised all those who turn aside from Thy commandments,”⁴ says: “If God were to despise sinners, He would despise indeed all men, because no man is without sin; but it is those who turn away from Him, whom they call *apostates*, that He despises.” You observe his statement: it is not to the effect that no man *was* without sin, as if he spoke of the past; but no man *is* without sin; and on this point, as I have already remarked, I have no contention with him. But if one refuses to submit to the Apostle John,—who does not himself declare, “If we were to say we *have had* no sin,” but “If we say we *have* no sin,”⁵—how is he likely to show deference to Bishop Hilary? It is in defence of the grace of Christ that I lift up my voice, without which grace no man is justified, although for nature free will is sufficient. Nay, [Christ] Himself lifts up His own voice in

¹ Rom. vii. 20.

² *Vestro amico*, in reference to Timasius and Jacobus.

³ Job xl. 4, and xlii. 6.

⁴ This is probably a version of Ps. cxix. 21, the Septuagint of which reads: Ἐπετίμησας τοῖς ὑπερηφάνοις, ἐπικατάρτατοι οἱ ἐκκλίνοντες ἀπὸ τῶν ἐντολῶν σου.

⁵ 1 John i. 8.

defence of the same. Let us submit to Him when He says: "Without me ye can do nothing."¹

CHAP. 74. [LXIII.]

He also quotes a passage from St. Ambrose; but in very deed this holy man rather opposes those who say that man cannot exist without sin in the present life. For, in order to support his statement, he avails himself of the instance of Zacharias and Elisabeth, because they are mentioned as "having walked in all the commandments and ordinances" of the law "blameless."² Well, but does he for all that deny that it was by God's grace that they did this through our Lord Jesus Christ? It was undoubtedly by such faith in Him that holy men lived of old, even before His death. It is He who sends the Holy Ghost that is given to us, through whom that love is shed abroad in our hearts whereby alone the righteous are justified. This same Holy Ghost is expressly mentioned by our good bishop, who reminds us that He is to be obtained by prayer (so that the will is not sufficient unless it be aided by Him); thus in his hymn he says:

"Votisque præstat sedulis,
Sanctum mereri Spiritum,"—

"To prayer He gives, when diligent, His Holy Spirit to possess."

CHAP. 75.—*Augustine adduces in reply some other passages of Ambrose.*

I will quote, on my side too, a passage out of this very work of St. Ambrose, from which our opponent has taken the statement which he deemed favourable for citation: "So it seemed good to me," he says; "but what he declares seemed good to him cannot have seemed good to him alone. For it is not simply to his human will that it seemed good, but also as it pleased Him, even Christ, who, says he, speaketh in me. He it is who causes that which is good in itself to seem good to ourselves also. For him on whom He has mercy He also calls. He, therefore, who follows Christ, when asked why he wished to be a Christian, can answer: Because it seemed good to me. In saying this he does not deny that it also pleased

¹ John xv. 5.

² Luke i. 6. See Ambrose *in loco*.

God; for from God proceeds the preparation of man's will, inasmuch as it is by God's grace that God is honoured by His saint." See now what your author must learn, if he takes pleasure in the words of Ambrose, how that man's will is prepared by God, and that it is of no importance, or, at any rate, does not much matter, by what means or at what time the preparation is accomplished, provided no doubt is raised as to whether the thing itself be capable of accomplishment without the grace of Christ. Then, again, how important it was that he should observe one point derived from the words of Ambrose which he quoted! For after that holy man had said, "Inasmuch as the Church has been gathered out of the world, that is, out of sinful men, how can it be spotless when composed of such polluted material, except that, in the first place, it is washed of its sinful state by the grace of Christ, and then, in the next place, abstains from actual sins through the character it has acquired of avoiding sin?" he added the following sentence, which your author has refused to quote for a self-evident reason; for [Ambrose] says: "It was not spotless from the very first, for that state was impossible for human nature. It is through the grace of God and that character of its own by which it no longer sins, that it comes to pass that it has the appearance of being without spot." Now who does not understand the reason why your author declined adding these words? It is, of course, so contrived in the discipline of the present life, that the holy Church shall arrive at last at that condition of unspotted purity which all holy men desire; and that it may in the world to come, and in a state unmixed with all soil of evil men, and undisturbed by any law of sin resisting the law of the mind, lead the purest life in a divine eternity. Still he should well observe what Bishop Ambrose says,—and his statement exactly tallies with the Scriptures: "It was not spotless from the very first, for that condition was impossible for human nature." By his phrase, "from the very first," he means indeed from the time of our being born of Adam. Adam no doubt was himself created in an immaculate condition; in the case, however, of those who are by nature children of wrath, deriving from him that which in him became corrupt, [Ambrose] distinctly

averred that it was an impossibility in human nature that they should be unspotted from the very first.

CHAP. 76. [LXIV.]

He quotes also John, bishop of Constantinople, as saying "that sin is not a substance, but a malignant act." Who denies this? "And because it is contrary to nature, therefore the law was given to oppose it, inasmuch also as it proceeds from the downward course of the liberty of our will." Who, too, denies this? However, the present question concerns our human nature in its corrupted state; it is a further question also concerning that grace of God whereby our nature is healed by the great Physician, Christ, whose remedy it would not need if it were only whole. And yet your author defends it as capable of not sinning, as if it were sound, or as if its freedom of will were self-sufficient.

CHAP. 77.

What Christian, again, is unaware of the fact that he quotes the blessed Sixtus, bishop of Rome and martyr of Christ, as having said, "God has conferred upon men liberty of will, in order that by purity and sinlessness of life they may become like unto God?"¹ But the man who appeals to such a free will ought to listen to it and believe, and ask Him in whom he believes to give him His assistance not to sin. For when he speaks of "becoming like unto God," it is indeed through God's love that men are to be like unto God,—even the love which is "shed abroad in our hearts," not by any ability of nature or the free will within us, but "by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."² Then, in respect of what the same martyr further says, "A pure mind is a holy temple for God, and a clean heart without sin is His best altar," who knows not that the clean heart must be brought up to this perfect state, whilst "the inward man is renewed day by day,"³ but yet not without the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord? Again, when he even says, "A man of chastity and without sin has received power from God to be

¹ This passage, which Pelagius had quoted as from Sixtus the Roman bishop and martyr, Augustine subsequently ascertained to have had for its author Sixtus or Xystus, a Pythagorean philosopher.

² Rom. v. 5.

³ 2 Cor. iv. 16.

a son of God," he of course meant it as an admonition that on a man's becoming so chaste and sinless (without raising any question as to when and where this perfection was to be obtained by him,—although in fact it is quite an interesting question among godly men, who are notwithstanding agreed as to the possibility of such perfection on the one hand, and on the other hand its impossibility except through "the one Mediator between God and men, the Man Christ Jesus;"¹ without raising the prior question, as I said before, Sixtus designed his words to be an admonition that, on any man's attaining such a high character), and thereby being rightly reckoned to be among the sons of God, the attainment must not be thought to have been the work of any power of his own, which indeed he, through grace, received from God; forasmuch as he possessed no such power in his nature, which had become vitiated and depraved,—even as we read in the Gospel, "But as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God,"² which they were not by nature, nor could at all become, unless by receiving Him they also received such power through His grace. This is the power which is claimed for itself by the fortitude of that love which is only communicated to us by the Holy Ghost bestowed upon us.

CHAP. 78. [LXV.]

We have next a quotation of some words of the venerable presbyter Jerome, from his exposition of the passage where it is written: "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God."³ Among other remarks, he says: "It is they whom no consciousness of sin reproves;" and he adds: "The pure man is seen by his purity of heart; the temple of God cannot be defiled." This perfection is, to be sure, wrought in us by endeavour, by labour, by prayer, by effectual importunity therein that we may be brought up to the perfection in which we may be able to see God with a pure heart, by His grace through our Lord Jesus Christ. As to his allegation, that the forementioned presbyter said, "God created us with freedom of will; we are drawn by necessity neither to virtue nor to vice; if it were otherwise, where there is necessity there

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5.² John i. 12.³ Matt. v. 8.

would be no crown of reward ;”—who would not allow this ? Who would not cordially accept it ? Who would deny that human nature was so created ? The reason, however, why in doing a right action there is no bondage of necessity, is that liberty is the essence of charity.

CHAP. 79. [LXVI.]—*A certain necessity of sinning.*

But let us revert to the apostle's assertion : “The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”¹ By whom given if not by Him who “ascended up on high, led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men ?”² Forasmuch, however, as there is, owing to the flaws which have vitiated our nature, though not owing to the constitution of our nature, a certain necessary tendency to sin, a man should listen, and in order that the said necessity may cease to exist, learn to say to God in his prayers, “Bring Thou me out of my necessities ;”³ because in the very offering up of such a prayer there is a struggle against the tempter, who fights against us concerning this very necessity ; and thus, by the assistance of grace through our Lord Jesus Christ, both the evil necessity will be removed and full liberty be bestowed.

CHAP. 80. [LXVII.]—*Two methods whereby sins, like diseases, are guarded against.*

Let us now turn to our own case. “Bishop Augustine also,” says your author, “in his books on free will has these words : ‘Whatever is that cause of the will, if it is impossible to resist it, submission to it is not sinful ; if, however, it may be resisted, should it not be submitted to, there will be no sin. Does it, perchance, deceive the unwary man ? Let him then beware that he be not deceived. Is the deception, however, so potent that it is not possible to guard against it ? If such be the case, then there are no sins in the case. For who sins in a case where precaution is quite impossible ? Sin, however, is committed ; precaution therefore is possible.’”⁴ I acknowledge it, these are my words ; but he, too, should condescend to acknowledge what I said previously. The question indeed is about the grace of God, which helps us as a medicine

¹ Rom. v. 5.

² Eph. iv. 8.

³ Ps. xxv. 17.

⁴ Augustine, *De Libero Arbitrio*, iii. 18.

through the Mediator; the discussion has no concern with the impossibility of righteousness. Whatever, then, may be the cause, it may be resisted. Most certainly it may. Now it is because of this fact that we pray for help, saying, "Lead us not into temptation."¹ This help we should not ask for if we supposed that resistance were quite impossible. It is possible to guard against sin, but by the help of Him who cannot be deceived.² For this very circumstance has much to do with guarding against sin that we can unfeignedly say, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."³ Now there are two ways whereby, even in bodily maladies, the evil is guarded against,—to prevent its occurrence, and, if it happen, to secure a speedy cure. To prevent its occurrence, we may find precaution in the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation;" to secure the prompt remedy, we have the resource in the prayer, "Forgive us our debts." Whether then the danger only threaten, or be inherent, it may be guarded against.

CHAP. 81.

In order, however, that my meaning on this subject may be clear not merely to him, but also to such persons as have not read those treatises of mine on the freedom of the will, which your author has read, and who have not only not read them, but probably do read *him*; I must go on to quote out of my books what he has omitted, but which, if he had perceived and quoted in his letter, no controversy would be left between us on this subject. For immediately after those words of mine which your friend has quoted, I expressly added, and (as fully as I could) worked out, the train of thought which might occur to any one's mind, to the following effect: "And yet some actions are disapproved of, even when they are done in ignorance, and are judged deserving of chastisement, as we read in the inspired authorities." After taking some examples out of these, I went on to speak also of infirmity as follows: "Some actions also encounter disapprobation, even when they are done from necessity; as when a man wishes to act rightly

¹ Matt. vi. 13.

² Augustine gives a similar reply to the objection in his *Retractationes*, i. 9.

³ Matt. vi. 12.

and cannot. For whence arise those utterances: 'For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do?'¹ Then, after quoting some other passages of the Holy Scriptures to the same effect, I say: "But all these are the sayings of persons who come from that condemnation of death; for if this is not man's punishment, but his nature, then those are no sins." Then, again, a little afterwards I add: "It remains, therefore, that this is the just punishment of persons who come of man's condemnation. Nor ought it to be wondered at, that either by ignorance man has not liberty of will to choose what he will rightly do, or that by the resistance of that carnal habit (which by force of mortal transmission has, in a certain sense, become engrafted into his nature), though seeing what ought rightly to be done, and wishing to do it, he yet is unable to accomplish it. For this is the justest penalty of sin, that a man should lose what he has refused to make a good use of, when he might with ease have done so if he would; which, however, amounts to this, that the man who knowingly refuses to do what is right loses the ability to do it when he wishes. For, in truth, to every soul that sins there accrue these two penal consequences—ignorance and difficulty. Out of the ignorance springs the error which disgraces; out of the difficulty arises the pain which afflicts. But to approve of falsehoods as if they were true, so as to err involuntarily, and to be unable, owing to the resistance and pain of carnal bondage, to refrain from deeds of lust, is not the nature of man as he was created, but the punishment of man as under condemnation. When, however, we speak of a free will to do what is right, we of course mean that liberty in which man was created." Some men at once deduce what seems to them a just objection from the transfer and transmission of sins of ignorance and difficulty from the first man to his posterity; my answer to such objectors is this: "I tell them, by way of a brief reply, to be silent, and to cease from murmuring against God. Perhaps their complaint might have been a proper one, if from among men there had not stood forth a vanquisher of error and of lust; but there is everywhere present One who calls off from himself, through the

¹ Rom. vii. 19.

creature by so many means, the man who serves the Lord, teaches him when believing, consoles him when hoping, encourages him when loving, helps him when endeavouring, hears him when praying. It is not reckoned to you as a fault that you are involuntarily ignorant, but that you neglect to search out what you are ignorant of; nor is it imputed to you in censure that you do not bind up the limbs that are wounded, but that you despise him who wishes to heal them.”¹ In such terms did I exhort them, as well as I could, to live righteously; nor did I frustrate the grace of God, without which the now obscured and tarnished nature of man can neither be enlightened nor purified. Our whole discussion with them on this subject turns upon this, that we frustrate not the grace of God which is in Jesus Christ our Lord by a perverted assertion of natural powers. In a passage occurring shortly after the last quoted one, I said in reference to these natural powers: “Of our actual nature we speak in one sense, when we properly and specially describe it as that human nature in which man was created faultless after his kind; and in another sense of that nature in which we are born ignorant and carnally minded, owing to the penal condition of man under condemnation, after the manner mentioned by the apostle, ‘We ourselves likewise were by nature children of wrath, even as others.’”²

CHAP. 82. [LXVIII.]

If, therefore, we wish “to rouse and kindle cold and sluggish souls by Christian exhortations to lead righteous lives,”³ we must first of all exhort them to that faith whereby they may become Christians, and be subjects of His name and authority, without whom they cannot be saved. If, however, they are already Christians, but neglect to lead holy lives, they must be chastised with alarms, and be aroused by the praises of reward,—in such a manner, indeed, that we must not forget to urge them to godly prayers as well as to virtuous actions, and furthermore to instruct them in such wholesome doctrine,

¹ *De Libero Arbitrio*, iii. 19.² Eph. ii. 3.³ This passage, and others in this and the following chapters, are marked as quotations, apparently cited by Pelagius from Augustine.

that they be induced thereby to thank [God] for being able to accomplish any step in that holy life which they have entered upon, without distraction or difficulty,¹ and whenever they do experience such "difficulty," that they then wrestle with God in most faithful and persistent prayer and ready works of mercy to obtain from Him a removal of the difficulty. But provided they thus progress, I am not over-anxious as to the *where* and the *when* of their perfection in the absolute fulness of holy living; only I solemnly assert, that wheresoever and whensoever the great climax is reached, it cannot be but by the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ. When, indeed, they have attained to the clear knowledge that they have no sin, let them not say "they have no sin, lest the truth be not in them;"² even as the truth is not in those persons who, though they have sin, yet say that they have it not.

CHAP. 83. [LXIX.]—*God enjoins no impossibility, because all things are possible and easy to love. The commandment of love never grievous.*

But "the precepts of the law are very good," if we use them lawfully.³ Indeed, by the very fact (of which we have the firmest conviction) "that God, being just and good, could not possibly have enjoined on us any impossibilities," we are admonished both what to do in easy paths and what to ask for when they are difficult. Now all things are easy for love to effect, to which (and which alone) "Christ's burden is light,"⁴—or rather, it is itself alone the burden which is light. Accordingly it is said, "And His commandments are not grievous;"⁵ so that whoever finds them grievous must regard the inspired statement about their "not being grievous" as having been capable of only this meaning, that there may be a state of heart to which they are not burdensome, and he must pray for that disposition which he at present wants, so as to be able to fulfil all that is commanded him. And this is the purport of what is said to Israel in Deuteronomy, if understood in a godly, sacred, and spiritual sense. [This is clear from the fact] that the apostle, after quoting

¹ For the "*difficulty*," which is one of the penal consequences of sin, see last chapter, about its middle.

² 1 John i. 8.

³ See 1 Tim. i. 8.

⁴ Matt. xi. 30.

⁵ 1 John v. 3.

the passage, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart"¹ (*and*, as the verse also has it, *in thine hands*,² for in man's heart are his spiritual hands), adds in explanation, "This is the word of faith which we preach."³ No man, therefore, who "returns to the Lord his God," as he is there commanded, "with all his heart and with all his soul,"⁴ will find God's commandment "grievous." How, indeed, can it be grievous, when it is the precept of love? Either, therefore, a man has not love, and then it is grievous; or he has love, and then it is not grievous. But he possesses love if he does what is there enjoined on Israel, by returning to the Lord his God with all his heart and with all his soul. "A new commandment," says [Christ,] "do I give unto you, that ye love one another;"⁵ while [His apostle writes,] "He that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law;"⁶ and again, "Love is the fulfilling of the law."⁷ In accordance with these sayings is that passage, "Had they trodden good paths, they would have found, indeed, the ways of righteousness easy."⁸ How then is it written, "Because of the words of Thy lips, I have kept the paths of difficulty,"⁹ except it be that both statements are true: These paths are paths of difficulty to fear; but to love they are easy?

CHAP. 84. [LXX.].—*The stages of love are also stages of holiness.*

Inchoate love, therefore, is inchoate holiness; advanced love is advanced holiness; great love is great holiness; "perfect love is perfect holiness,"—but this "love is out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned,"¹⁰ "which in this life is then the greatest, when life itself is contemned in comparison with it."¹¹ I wonder, however, whether it has not a soil in which to grow after it has quitted this mortal life! But in what place and at what time soever it shall reach that state of absolute perfection, which shall admit of no increase, it is certainly not "shed abroad in our hearts" by

¹ Deut. xxx. 14, quoted Rom. x. 8.

² According to the Septuagint, which adds after ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου the words καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου. This was probably Pelagius' reading.

³ Rom. x. 8.

⁴ Deut. xxx. 2.

⁵ John xiii. 34.

⁶ Rom. xiii. 8.

⁷ Rom. xiii. 10.

⁸ Prov. ii. 20 (Septuagint).

⁹ Ps. xvii. 4.

¹⁰ 1 Tim. i. 5.

¹¹ See note at beginning of ch. 82 for the meaning of this mark of quotation.

any energies either of the nature or the volition that are within us, but "by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us,"¹ and which both helps our infirmity and co-operates with our strength. For it is itself indeed the grace of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, appertaineth eternity, and all goodness, for ever and ever. Amen.

¹ Rom. v. 5.

PREFACE TO THE TREATISE

ON THE

PERFECTION OF MAN'S RIGHTEOUSNESS.

AUGUSTINE has made no mention of this treatise in his book of *Retractations*; for the reason, no doubt, that it formed a portion of the EPISTLES, for which he designed a separate statement of *Retractations*. In all the MSS. this work begins with his usual epistolary salutation: "*Sanctis fratribus et coepiscopis Eutropio et Paulo, Augustinus*" [Augustine, to his holy brethren and fellow-bishops Eutropius and Paulus]. And yet, by general consent, this epistle has been received as a treatise,—and is so classed, not only in those volumes of his works which contain the copy of the work, but also in the writings of those ancient authors who quote it. Amongst the more renowned of these, and who are at the same time better acquainted with Augustine's writings, POSSIDIUS (*In indiculo*, 4) and FULGENTIUS (*Ad Monimum*, i. 3) expressly call this work "*A Treatise on the Perfection of Man's Righteousness.*" So far nearly all the MSS. agree, but a few (including the *Codd. Audöenensis* and *Pratellensis*) add these words to the general title: "*Adversus eos qui asserunt hominem posse fieri justum solis suis viribus*" [In opposition to those who assert that it is possible for a man to become righteous by his own sole strength]. In a MS. belonging to the Church of Rheims there occurs this inscription: "*Liber de definitionibus quæ dicuntur Cælestii*" [The book of what are called the definitions or breviates of Cælestius]. Prosper, in his work against Collator, ch. 43, advises his reader to peruse, besides some other of Augustine's "*books,*" that which he wrote "to the bishops Paulus and

Eutropius in opposition to the questions of Pelagius and Cœlestius."

From this passage of Prosper, however, in which he mentions, but with no regard to accurate order, some of the short treatises of Augustine against the Pelagians, nobody could rightly show that this work *On the Perfection of Man's Righteousness* was later in time than his work *On Marriage and Concupiscence*, or than the six books against Julianus, which are mentioned previously in the same passage by Prosper. Now, at the conclusion of the present treatise, Augustine hesitates as yet to censure those persons who affirmed that men are living or have lived in this life righteously without any sin at all: their opinion Augustine, in the passage referred to (just as in his treatises *On Nature and Grace*, and *On the Spirit and the Letter*), does not yet think it necessary stoutly to resist. Nothing had as yet, therefore, been determined on this point; nor were there yet enacted, in opposition to this opinion, the three well-known canons (6-8) of the Council of Carthage, which was held in the year 418. Afterwards, however, on the authority of these canons, he cautions people against the opinion as a pernicious error, as one may see from many passages in his books *Against the two Epistles of the Pelagians*, especially Book iv. ch. x. (27), where he says: "Let us now consider that third point of theirs, which each individual member of Christ as well as His entire [mystical] body regards with horror, where they contend that there are in this life, or have been, righteous persons without any sin whatever." In the year 414, in an epistle (157) to Hilary, when answering the questions which were then being agitated in Sicily, he certainly expresses himself in the same tone, and almost in the same language, on this subject of sinlessness, as that which he employs at the end of this present treatise. "But those persons," says he (in ch. ii. of that epistle), "however much one may tolerate them when they affirm that there either are, or have been, men besides the one Prince of saints who have been wholly free from sin; yet when they allege that man's own free-will is sufficient for fulfilling the Lord's commandments, even when unassisted by God's grace and the gift of the Holy Spirit for the performance of good

works, the idea is altogether worthy of anathema and of perfect detestation." Now, on comparing these words with the conclusion of this treatise before us, nothing will appear more probable than that the work which supplies the refutation of Coelestius' questions, which were also brought over from Sicily, was written not long after the above-mentioned epistle. This work Possidius, in his index, places immediately after the treatise *On Nature and Grace*, and before the book *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*. Augustine, however, does not mention this work in his epistle (169) which he addressed to Evodius about the end of the year 415; but he intimates in it that he had published an answer to the *Commonitorium* of Orosius, wherein that author stated that "the bishops Eutropius and Paulus had already given information to Augustine about certain formidable¹ heresies." Some suppose that this statement refers to the letter which they despatched to Augustine along with Coelestius' propositions. However that be, it is not unreasonable to believe that they, not long after Orosius' arrival in Africa (that is, before the midsummer of the year 415), had sent these propositions to him, and that Augustine soon afterwards wrote back to Eutropius and Paulus a refutation of them, his answer to Orosius having been previously given.

Furthermore, Coelestius, whose name is inscribed in the propositions, "wrote to his parents from his monastery," as Gennadius informs us in his work on Church writers (*De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*), "before he fell in with the teaching of Pelagius, three letters in the shape of short treatises, necessary for all seekers after God." Afterwards he openly professed the Pelagian heresy, and published a short treatise, in which, besides other topics, he acknowledged in the Church of Carthage that even infants had redemption by being baptized into Christ,—an episcopal decision on the question having been obtained in that city about the commencement of the year 412, as we learn from an epistle to Pope Innocent (amongst the Epistles of Augustine [175, n. 1 and 6]), as well as from the epistle [157, n. 22] which we have referred to above; and from his work *On the Merits of Sins*, i. 62, and

¹ Aliquantis.

ii. 59; also from his treatise *On Original Sin*, 21; and his work *Against Julianus*, iii. 9. Another work by an anonymous writer, but which was commonly attributed to Cœlestius, divided into chapters, is mentioned in the treatise which follows the present one, *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*; see chapters 29, 30, and 62. There were extant, moreover, in the year 417, several small books or tracts of Cœlestius, which Augustine, in his work *On the Grace of Christ*, 31, 32, and 36, says were produced by Cœlestius himself in some ecclesiastical proceedings at Rome under Zosimus. Augustine, at the commencement of the present work *On the Perfection of Man's Righteousness*, mentions an undoubted work of Cœlestius as having been seen by him, from which he discovered that the definitions or breviates therein examined by Augustine were not unsuited to the tone and temper of Cœlestius. This was very probably the book which Jerome quotes in his Epistle to Ctesiphon, written in the year 413 or 314. These are Jerome's words: "One of his followers [that is, Pelagius'], who was already in fact become the master and the leader of all that army, and 'a vessel of wrath,'¹ in opposition to the apostle, runs on through thickets, not of *sylogisms*, as his admirers are apt to boast, but of *solecisms*, and philosophizes and disputes to the following effect: 'If I do nothing without God's help, and if everything which I shall achieve is owing to His operations solely, then it follows that it is not I who work, but only God's work is to be crowned in me. In vain, therefore, has He conferred on me the power of will, if I am unable to exercise it fully without His incessant help. That volition, indeed, is destroyed which requires the assistance of another. But it is a free will which God has given to me; and *free* it can only remain, if I do whatever I wish. The state of the case then is this: I either use once for all the power which has been bestowed on me, so as to retain my will in freedom; or else, if I require the assistance of another, all liberty of volition in me perishes.'"

¹ Rom. ix. 22.

A TREATISE

CONCERNING

MAN'S PERFECTION IN RIGHTEOUSNESS.

BY

AURELIUS AUGUSTINE,

BISHOP OF HIPPO,

A. D. 415.

A PAPER CONTAINING SUNDRY PROPOSITIONS,¹ SAID TO HAVE BEEN DRAWN UP BY CÆLESTIUS, WAS PUT INTO THE HANDS OF AUGUSTINE. IN THIS DOCUMENT, CÆLESTIUS, OR SOME PERSON WHO SHARED IN HIS ERRORS, HAD RECKLESSLY ASSERTED THAT A MAN HAD IT IN HIS POWER TO LIVE HERE WITHOUT SIN. AUGUSTINE FIRST REFUTES THE SEVERAL PROPOSITIONS IN BRIEF ANSWERS, SHOWING THAT THE PERFECT AND PLENARY STATE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS, IN WHICH A MAN EXISTS ABSOLUTELY WITHOUT SIN, IS UNATTAINABLE WITHOUT GRACE BY THE MERE RESOURCES OF OUR CORRUPT NATURE, AND IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH THIS PRESENT STATE OF EXISTENCE. HE NEXT PROCEEDS TO CONSIDER THE AUTHORITIES WHICH THE PAPER CONTAINED AS GATHERED OUT OF THE SCRIPTURES; SOME OF THEM TEACHING MAN TO BE "UNSPOTTED" AND "PERFECT;" OTHERS MENTIONING THE COMMANDMENTS OF GOD AS "NOT GRIEVOUS;" WHILE OTHERS AGAIN ARE QUOTED AS OPPOSED TO THE AUTHORITATIVE PASSAGES WHICH THE CATHOLICS WERE ACCUSTOMED TO ADVANCE AGAINST THE PELAGIANS.

CHAP. I.

THAT charity of yours, which in both of you is so conspicuous and so constraining as even to afford delight to one in obeying its commands, has laid me under an obligation to reply to some propositions which are said to be the work of Cœlestius; for so runs the prefatory note on the paper which you have given me, "*Definitiones, ut dicitur, Cœlestii*"

¹ These *breves definitiones*, which Augustine also calls *ratiocinationes*, are short argumentative statements, which we propose to designate *breviates*.

["The definitions, so it is said, of Cœlestius"]. As for this prefatory note, I take it that it does not refer so much to him as to those persons who have brought this report from Sicily, where Cœlestius is expressly said not to be; although many there¹ make boastful pretension of holding views like his, who, to use the apostle's word, "are themselves deceived, and lead others also astray."² That these views are, however, in accordance with his teaching, or that of sundry associates³ of his, we can well imagine. For the above-mentioned brief definitions, or rather argumentative propositions, are by no means at variance with his opinion, such as I have seen it expressed in another work, of which he is the undoubted author. There was therefore good reason, I think, for the report which those brethren, who brought these tidings to us, heard in Sicily, that Cœlestius taught such opinions and committed them to writing. I should like, so far as I could, so to meet the obligation imposed on me by your brotherly kindness, as to contrive that my own answers should be as brief [as this man's breviate]. But, at the same time, I must set forth the propositions also which elicit my answers; otherwise, who will be able to form a judgment of the value of my confutation? Still I will try to the best of my ability, assisted, too, as God shall mercifully permit, by your own prayers, so to conduct the discussion as to keep it from running to an unnecessary length.

CHAP. II.—(1.) *The first breviate of Cœlestius.*

"First of all," says he, "we must ask any one who denies man's ability to live without sin of what sort every sin is,—

¹ In his epistle (157) to Hilary, written a little while before this work, he mentions Cœlestius and the condemnation of his errors in a Council held at Carthage; he expresses also some apprehension of Cœlestius attempting to spread his opinions in *Sicily*: "Whether he be himself there," says Augustine, "or only others who are partners in his errors, there are too many of them; and, unless they be checked, they lead astray others to join their sect; and so great is their increase, that I cannot tell whither they will force their way," etc.

² 2 Tim. iii. 13.

³ *Sociorum ejus.* It has been proposed to read *sectatorum ejus*,—not unsuitably (although not justified by ms. evidence), because Cœlestius "had," to use Jerome's words, "by this time turned out a master with a following,—the leader of a perfect army."—*Jerome's Epistle to Ctesiphon*, written in the year 413 or 414.

is it such as can be avoided? or is it unavoidable? If it is unavoidable, then it is not sin; if it can be avoided, then a man can live without the sin, which can be avoided. No right nor rule permits us to designate as sin that which cannot in any way be avoided." Our answer to this is, that sin can be avoided, if our corrupt nature be healed by God's grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ. For, as far as it is in an unsound state, so far does it either through blindness fail to see, or through infirmity fail to accomplish, that which it ought to do; "for the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh,"¹ so that a man cannot do the things which he would.

(2.) *The second breviate.*

"We must next ask, whether sin comes from choice, or from necessity? If from necessity, it is not sin; if from choice, it can be avoided." We answer as before; and in order that we may be healed, we pray to Him to whom that suffrage is addressed in the psalm: "Lead Thou me out of my necessities."²

(3.) *The third breviate.*

"Again we must ask, what sin is,—is it natural? or is it accidental? If natural, it is not sin; if accidental, it can get out of the way; and if it can get out of one's way, it can be avoided; and man can very well dispense with that which can be avoided." The answer to this is, that sin is not natural; on the contrary, nature (especially in that corrupt state from which we have become by nature "children of wrath"³) has too little power of will to avoid sin, unless assisted and healed by God's grace through our Lord Jesus Christ.

(4.) *The fourth breviate.*

"We must then ask, What is sin,—a real thing, or only an act? If a reality, it must of course have an author; and if it be admitted to have an author, then another besides God will manifestly be introduced as the author of a real thing. Now since it is impious to make such an admission as this, we are driven to the conclusion that every sin is an act, not a reality. If therefore it is an act, on this very ground it is

¹ Gal. v. 17.

² Ps. xxv. 17.

³ Eph. ii. 3.

capable of being avoided." Our reply is, that sin no doubt is called an action, and is such, not a real thing. But then in the body lameness by the same rule is an act, not a thing, since it is the foot itself, or the body, or the human being who walks lame because of an injured foot, that is the thing; but still the man cannot avoid the lameness, unless his foot be cured. The same change may take place in the inward man, but it is by God's grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ. The very defect which causes the lameness of the man is neither the foot, nor the body, nor indeed the lameness itself; for there is of course no lameness in the case, when there is no walking, although undoubtedly there is the inherent defect which causes the lameness whenever there is an attempt to walk. He should therefore ask, what name must be given to this defect,—would he have it called a thing, or an act, or rather a disordered quality in the thing, which causes the existence of the deformed act? So in the inward man the soul is the really existing thing, the theft is the act, and dishonest desire is the vitiated condition, or quality by which the soul becomes evilly affected, even when it does nothing in immediate gratification of its avaricious principle,—even when it hears the prohibition, "Thou shalt not covet,"¹ and censures its own covetousness, and yet retains its evil affection still. By faith, however, it receives renovation; in other words, it receives a healing remedy, and applies it day by day,²—yet only by God's grace through our Lord Jesus Christ.

CHAP. III.—(5.) *The fifth breviate.*

"We must next inquire whether a man ought to be without sin? No doubt he ought. If he ought, he is able; if he is not able, for that reason he ought not. Now if a man ought not to be without sin, it follows that he ought to be with sin,—and then it ceases to be sin at all, if it be so plainly due. Since, however, it is absurd even to put such a statement into words, we are obliged to confess that man ought to be without sin; and it is clear that his obligation is not more than his ability." We frame our answer with the same illustration as we employed in our previous reply.

¹ Ex. xx. 17.

² 2 Cor. iv. 16.

When we see a lame man who has the opportunity of being cured of his lameness, we of course have a right to say: That man ought not to be lame; and since this is the case, he can avoid the lameness. And yet this ability of his does not immediately ensue whenever he wishes; but only after the application of the remedy and the completion of the cure,—when the remedial resource has assisted his will. The same thing takes place in the inward man in relation to sin, which is its lameness, by the grace of Him who “came not to call the righteous, but sinners;”¹ since “the whole need not the physician, but only they that be sick.”²

(6.) *The sixth breviate.*

“Again, we have to inquire whether man is commanded to be without sin; for either he is not able [so to live,] and then there is no such commandment; or else if there is such a commandment, he has the ability. For why should that be commanded to be done, which there is no ability at all to do?” The answer is obvious. Man is most wisely commanded to walk with right steps, on purpose that, when he has discovered his own inability to do even this, he may seek the remedy which is provided for the inward man to cure the lameness of sin, even the grace of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

(7.) *The seventh breviate.*

“The next question we shall have to propose is, whether God wills that man be without sin. No doubt God wills it; and no doubt there is the ability on man’s part. For who is so foolhardy as to hesitate to believe that to be possible, which he has no doubt about God’s willing to be done?” This is the answer. If God willed not that man should be without sin, He would not have sent His Son without sin, to heal men of their sins. This takes place in believers, who are being renewed day by day,³ until their righteousness becomes perfect, like fully restored health.

(8.) *The eighth breviate.*

“Again, this question must be asked: in what manner God would have a man live—with sin, or without sin? Beyond a

¹ Matt. ix. 13.

² Matt. ix. 12.

³ 2 Cor. iv. 16.

doubt, it is not with sin that He would have him live. We must reflect how great would be the impious blasphemy for it to be said that man had it in his power to exist with sin, which God does not wish; and for it to be denied that he had it in his power to live without sin, which God wishes: just as if God had created any man for such a result as this,—that he should be capable of being what He would not have him be; and incapable of being what He would have him be; and that he should rather lead an existence contrary to His will, than one which should be in accordance therewith." This has been in fact already answered; but I see that it is necessary for me to make here an additional remark, that "we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it."¹ Plenary righteousness, therefore, will only then be reached, when fulness of [moral soundness, or] health is attained; and this fulness of health shall be when there is fulness of love,² for "love is the fulfilling of the law;"³ and then shall come fulness of love, when "we shall see Him even as He is."⁴ Nor will any addition to love be possible more, when faith shall have reached the fruition of sight.

CHAP. IV.—(9.) *The ninth breviate. (The hard necessity of possessing sin has always pursued sinners.)*

"The next question we shall require to be solved is this: By what means is it brought about that man exists with sin? Is it through the necessity of his nature, or through the choice of his will? If it is through the necessity of his nature, he is blameless; if through his own will, then the question arises, from whom he has received this freedom of will? No doubt, from God. Well, but that which God bestows is certainly good. This cannot be gainsaid. On what principle, then, is a thing proved to be good, if it is more prone to evil than to good? For there is a greater proneness to evil than to good in an arrangement which renders it im-

¹ Rom. viii. 24, 25.

² Of course we here miss the pleasant terseness of the original: "Tunc plena sanitas, quando plena caritas."

³ Rom. xiii. 10.

⁴ 1 John iii. 2.

possible for a man to live without sin." The answer is this: It came to pass by the exercise of free will that man associated himself with sin; but a penal viciousness closely followed thereon, and out of the liberty produced necessity. Hence the cry of faith to God, "Lead Thou me out of my necessities."¹ With these necessities upon us, we are either unable to understand what we want, or else (while having the wish) we are not strong enough to accomplish what we have come to understand. Now real liberty is promised to believers by the Deliverer. "If the Son," says He, "shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."² For, vanquished by the sin into which it fell by the bent of its will, nature has lost its liberty. Hence another Scripture says, "For of whom a man is overcome, of the same is he brought in bondage."³ Since therefore "the whole need not the physician, but only they that be sick;"⁴ so likewise it is not the free that need the Deliverer, but only the enslaved. Hence the cry of joy to Him for deliverance, "Thou hast saved my soul from the straits of necessity."⁵ For true liberty is also real sanity—[the condition of "the whole."] And this state would never have been lost, if the will of man had remained good. But because the will turned to sinning, the hard necessity of possessing sin pursued the sinner; [and will pursue him,] until his infirmity be wholly remedied, and such freedom be regained, that there must needs be, on the one hand, a permanent will to live happily, and, on the other hand, a voluntary and happy necessity of living virtuously also, and of always avoiding sin.

(10.) *The tenth breviae.*

"Since God made man good, and, in addition to this, further commanded him to do good, how impious it is for us to hold that man is evil, when he was neither made so, nor taught to act so; and to deny him the capability of being good, although he was both made so, and commanded to act so!" Our answer here is: Since then it was not man himself, but God, who made man good; so also is it God, and not man himself, who remakes him to be good, while liberating him

¹ Ps. xxv. 17.

⁴ Matt. ix. 12.

² John viii. 38.

⁵ Ps. xxxi. 7 (Septuagint).

³ 2 Pet. ii. 19.

from the evil which he himself did upon his willing, believing, and invoking such a deliverance. But all this is effected by the renewal day by day of the inward man,¹ by the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, with a view to the outward man's resurrection at the last day to an eternity not of punishment, but of life.

CHAP. V.—(11.) *The eleventh breviate.* (*The general prohibition in Scripture is, "Thou shalt not covet," and the general precept, "Thou shalt love;" the office of the law.*)

"The next question which must be put is, in how many ways all sin becomes apparent? In two, if I mistake not: when either those things are done which are forbidden, or those things are left undone which are bidden. Now, it is just as certain that all things which are forbidden are able to be avoided, as it is that all things which are commanded are able to be effected. For it is vain either to forbid or to enjoin that which cannot either be guarded against or accomplished. And how shall we deny the possibility of man's living without sin, when we are compelled to admit that he can as well avoid all those things which are forbidden, as do all those which are commanded?" My answer is, that in the Holy Scriptures there are many divine precepts, to mention the whole of which would be too laborious; but the Lord, who on earth consummated His word and also abridged it,² expressly declared that the law and the prophets hung on two commandments,³ that we might understand that whatever else has been enjoined on us by God ends in these two commandments, and must be referred to them: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;"⁴ and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."⁵ "On these two commandments," says Christ, "hang all the law and the prophets."⁶ Whatever, therefore, we are by God's law forbidden, and whatever we are bidden to do, we are forbidden and bidden with the direct object of fulfilling these two commandments. And probably the general prohibition is, "Thou shalt not covet;"⁷ and the

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 16.

³ Matt. xxii. 40.

⁶ Matt. xxii. 40.

² An application of Rom. ix. 28.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 37.

⁷ Ex. xx. 27.

⁵ Matt. xxii. 39.

general precept, "Thou shalt love."¹ Accordingly the Apostle Paul, in a certain place, briefly embraced the two, expressing the prohibition in these words, "Be not conformed to this world,"² and the command in these, "But be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind."³ The former falls under the negative precept, not to covet; the latter under the positive one, to love. The one has reference to continence, the other to righteousness. The one enjoins avoidance of evil; the other, pursuit of good. By eschewing covetousness we put off the old man, and by showing love we put on the new. But no man can be continent unless God endow him with the gift;⁴ nor is God's love shed abroad in our hearts by our own selves, but by the Holy Ghost that is given to us.⁵ This, however, takes place day after day in those who advance by willing, believing, and praying, and who, "forgetting those things which are behind, reach forth unto those things which are before."⁶ For the reason why the law inculcates all these precepts is, that when a man has failed in fulfilling them, he may not be swollen with pride, and so exalt himself, but may in very weariness betake himself to grace. Thus the law fulfils its office as "schoolmaster," so terrifying the man as "to lead him to Christ," to give Him his love.⁷

CHAP. VI.—*The twelfth breviate. (The lust of the flesh nothing else than the desire of sin.)*

"Again the question arises, how it is that man is unable to live without sin,—by his will, or by nature? If by nature, it is not sin; if by his will, then will can very easily be changed by will." We answer by reminding him how he ought to reflect on the extreme presumption of saying—not simply that it is possible (for this no doubt is undeniable, when God's grace comes in aid), but—that it is "*very easy*" for will to be changed by will. Whereas the apostle says, "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye do not the things that ye would."⁸ He does not say, "These are contrary the one to the other, so that ye will not do the things that ye can," but, "so that ye do not the things that

¹ Deut. vi. 5.² Rom. xii. 2.³ Rom. xii. 2.⁴ Wisd. viii. 21.⁵ Rom. v. 5.⁶ Phil. iii. 13.⁷ Gal. iii. 24.⁸ Gal. v. 17.

ye would."¹ How happens it, then, that the lust of the flesh (which of course is culpable and vicious, and is nothing else than a desire for sin, as to which the same apostle instructs us not to let it "reign in our mortal body;"² by which expression he shows us plainly enough that that must have an existence in our mortal body which must not be permitted to hold a dominion in it;—how happens it, I say, that such lust of the flesh) has not been changed by that will, which the apostle clearly implied the existence of in his words, "So that ye do not the things that ye *would* [or *will*]," if so be that the will can so easily be changed by will? Not that we, indeed, by this argument throw the blame upon the nature either of the soul or of the body, which God created, and which is wholly good; but we say that it has been vitiated by man's own will, and cannot be made whole without the grace of God.

(13.) *The thirteenth breviate.*

"The next question we have to ask is this: If man cannot exist without sin, whose fault is it,—man's own, or some one's else? If man's own, in what way is he to blame for not being that which he is unable to be?" We reply, that man is to blame for not being without sin entirely on this account, because it has by man's sole will come to pass that he has come into such a necessity as cannot be overcome by man's sole will.

(14.) *The fourteenth breviate. (Why the law is called "the strength of sin.")*

"Again the question must be asked, If man's nature is good, as nobody but Marcion or Manichæus will venture to deny, in what way is it good if it is impossible for it to be free from evil? For that all sin is evil who can gainsay?" We answer, that man's nature is both good, and is also able to be free from evil. Therefore do we earnestly pray, "Deliver us from evil."³ This deliverance, indeed, is not fully wrought, so long as the soul is oppressed by the body, which is hastening to corruption.⁴ This process, however, is being effected by grace through faith, so that it may be said by and by,

¹ *ἵνα μὴ ἂν ὀλέηται, ταῦτα ποιῆται.*

³ *Matt. vi. 13.*

² *Rom. vi. 12.*

⁴ *Wisd. ix. 15.*

“O death, where is thy struggle? Where is thy sting, O death? The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law;”¹ because the law by prohibiting sin only increases the desire for it, unless the Holy Ghost spreads abroad that love, which shall then be full and perfect, when we shall see face to face.

(15.) *The fifteenth breviatè.*

“And this, moreover, has to be said: God is certainly righteous; this cannot be denied. But God imputes every sin to man. This too, I suppose, must be allowed, that whatever shall not be imputed as sin is not sin. Now if there is any sin which is unavoidable, how is God said to be righteous, when He is supposed to impute to any man [as sin] that which cannot be avoided?” We reply, that long ago was it declared in opposition to the proud, “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sin.”² Now He does not impute it to those who say to Him in faith, “Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.”³ And justly does He withhold this imputation, because that is just which He says: “With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.”⁴ That, however, is sin in which there is either not the love which ought to be, or where the love is less than it ought to be,⁵—whether it be avoidable by the human will or inevitable; because when avoidable, the man’s present will does it, [or] his past will did it; and yet it can be avoided,—not, however, when the proud will is lauded, but when the humble one is assisted.

CHAP. VII.—(16.) *The sixteenth breviatè.*

After all these disputations, their author introduces himself in person as arguing with another person, and represents himself as under examination, and as being addressed by his examiner: “Show me the man who is without sin.” He answers: “I show you one who might be without sin.” His examiner then says to him: “And who is he?” He answers promptly enough: “You are the man.”* “But if,” he adds, “you were

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 35, 36.

² Ps. xxxii. 2.

³ Matt. vi. 12.

⁴ Matt. vii. 2.

⁵ See above, in his work *De Spiritu et Litterà*, 64; and *De Naturà et Gratià*, 45.

to say, 'I, at any rate, cannot live without sin,' then you must answer me, 'Whose fault is that?' If you then were to say, 'My own fault,' you must be further asked, 'And how is it your fault, if, [as you say,] you cannot live without sin?'" He again represents himself as under examination, and thus accosted: "Are you really yourself without sin, who allege that a man can live without sin?" And he answers [by retorting a question:] "Whose fault is it that I am not without sin? But if," continues he, "he had said in reply, 'The fault is your own;' then the answer would be, 'How *my* fault, when I am unable to live without sin?'" Now our answer to all this running argument is, that no controversy ought to have been raised between them about such words as these; because he nowhere ventures to affirm that a man (either any one else, or himself) IS without sin, but he merely said in reply that he COULD BE,—a position which we do not ourselves deny. Only the question arises, when this possibility accrues, and through whom? If it occurs at the present time, then by no faithful soul which is enclosed within the body of this death must this prayer be offered, or such words as these be spoken, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors,"¹ since in holy baptism all past debts have been already forgiven. But whoever tries to persuade us that such a prayer is not proper for faithful members of Christ, does in fact acknowledge nothing else than that he is not himself a Christian. If, again, it is through himself that a man is able to live without sin, then did Christ die in vain. But "Christ is not dead in vain." No man, therefore, can be without sin, even if he wish it, unless he be assisted by the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ. And that this perfection may be attained, there is even now a training carried on in growing [Christians,] and there will be by all means a completion made, after the conflict with death is spent, and love, which is now cherished by the operation of faith and hope, shall be perfected in the fruition of sight and possession.

¹ Matt. vi. 12.

CHAP. VIII.—(17.) *It is one thing to depart from the body, another thing to be liberated from the body of this death; the recompense of eternal life shall be bestowed on no man who has not in the present life merited it.*

He next proposes to establish his point by the testimony of Holy Scripture. Let us carefully observe what kind of defence he makes. "There are passages," says he, "which go to show that man is commanded to live without sin." Now our answer to this is: Whether such commands are given is not at all the point in question, for the fact is clear enough; but whether the thing which is evidently commanded be itself at all capable of accomplishment in the body of this death, wherein "the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh, so that we cannot do the things that we would."¹ Now from this body of death not every one is liberated who ends the present life, but only he who in this life has received grace, and given proof of not receiving it in vain by spending his days in good works. For it is plainly one thing to depart from the body, which all men are obliged to do in the last day of their present life, and another to be delivered from the body of this death, —a liberation which God's grace alone, through our Lord Jesus Christ, imparts to His faithful saints. It is after this life, indeed, that the reward of perfection is bestowed, but only upon those by whom in their present life has been acquired the merit of such a recompense. For no one, after going hence, shall arrive at fulness of righteousness, unless, whilst here, he shall have run his course by hungering and thirsting after it. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled."²

(18.) *The righteousness of this life comprehended in three parts,—fasting, almsgiving, and prayer; an enemy must be forgiven if he repents and asks forgiveness. From the Lord's Prayer we find that the faithful are not here perfect, without sin.*

As long, then, as we are "absent from the Lord, we walk by faith, not by sight;"³ whence it is said, "The just shall live by his faith."⁴ Our righteousness in this pilgrimage of absence is such, that we now press forward to that perfect and plenary righteousness in which love shall be fulfilled and perfected in the sight of its glory; [and this we accomplish]

¹ Gal. v. 17.

² Matt. v. 6.

³ 2 Cor. v. 6.

⁴ Hab. ii. 4.

in the rectitude and perfection of our actual course, by "keeping under our body and bringing it into subjection,"¹ by doing our alms cheerfully and heartily, while bestowing kindnesses and forgiving the trespasses which have been committed against us, and by "continuing instant in prayer;"²—and doing all this with sound doctrine, whereon are built a right faith, a firm hope, and a pure charity. This is now our righteousness, in which we pass through our course hungering and thirsting after the perfect and plenary righteousness, in order that we may after all be satisfied therewith. Therefore our Lord in the Gospel (after saying, "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness³ before men, to be seen of them,"⁴ that we measure not our course of life by the limit of human glory) goes on to expound the righteousness itself; but He instances only these three [constituents] of it,—fasting, alms, and prayers. Now in *the fasting* He indicates the entire subjugation of the body; in *the alms*, all kindness of will and deed, either by giving or forgiving; and in *prayers* He implies all the rules of a holy desire. Now, although by the subjugation of the body a check is given to that concupiscence, which ought not only to be bridled, but to be put altogether out of existence (and which will not be found at all in that state of perfect righteousness, where sin shall be absolutely excluded), yet it often exerts its immoderate desire even in the use of things which are allowable and right. Even in that real beneficence in which the just man consults his neighbour's welfare, things are sometimes done which are prejudicial, although it was thought that they would be advantageous. Sometimes, too, through infirmity, when the amount of the kindness and trouble which is expended either falls short of the necessities of the objects, or is of little use under the circumstances, then there steals over us a disappointment which tarnishes that "cheerfulness" which secures to the "giver" the approbation of God.⁵ This trail of sadness, how-

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 27.

² Rom. xii. 12.

³ For this reading of *δικαιοσύνην* instead of *ἐλεημοσύνην* there is high ms. authority. It is admitted also by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Alford, and in the margin of our Bibles.

⁴ Matt. vi. 1.

⁵ 2 Cor. ix. 7.

ever, is the greater or the less, as each man has made more or less progress in his kindly purposes. If, then, these considerations, and such as these, be duly weighed, we are only right when we say in our prayers, "Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors."¹ But what we say in our prayers we must carry into act, even to loving our very enemies; or if any one who is still a babe in Christ fails as yet to reach this point, he must at any rate, whenever one who has trespassed against him repents and craves his pardon, exercise forgiveness from the bottom of his heart, if he would have his heavenly Father listen to his prayer.

(19.) *The commandment of love shall be perfectly fulfilled in the life to come. The lusting of the flesh means that the soul itself lusts in a carnal manner.*

And in this prayer, unless we choose to be contentious, there is placed before our view a mirror of sufficient brightness in which to behold the life of the righteous, who live by faith, and finish their course, although they are not without sin. Therefore they say, "Forgive us," because they have not yet arrived at the end of their course. Hence the apostle says, "Not as if I had already attained, either were already perfect. . . . Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded."² In other words, let us, as many as are running our course to perfection, be thus resolved, that, being not yet perfected, we pursue our course to perfection along the way by which we have thus far run perfectly, in order that "when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part may be done away;"³ that is, may cease to be but in part any longer, but become whole and complete. For to faith and hope shall succeed at once the very substance itself, no longer to be believed in and hoped for, but to be seen and grasped. Love, however, which is the greatest among the three, is not to be superseded, but increased and fulfilled,—contemplating in full vision what it used to see by faith, and acquiring in actual fruition what it once only embraced in

¹ Matt. vi. 12.

² Phil. iii. 12-15.

³ 1 Cor. xiii. 10.

hope. Then in all this plenitude of charity will be fulfilled the commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind."¹ So long, indeed, as there remains [in our present state] any remnant of the lust of the flesh, to be kept in check by the rein of continence, God is by no means loved with all one's soul. For the flesh does not lust without the soul; although it is the flesh which is said to lust, because the soul lusts by means of the flesh.² In that perfect state the just man shall live absolutely without any sin, since there will be in his members no law warring against the law of his mind,³ but wholly will he love God, with all his heart, with all his soul, and with all his mind,⁴ which is the first and chief commandment. For why should not such perfection be enjoined on man, although in this life nobody may attain to it? The course is a right one, even if it be not known whereunto it must finally run. How, indeed, could it be known at all, unless it were pointed out in such precepts?⁵ Let us therefore "so run that we may obtain."⁶ For all who run rightly will obtain,—not as in the contest of the theatre, where all indeed run, but only one wins the prize.⁷ Let us, [I say,] run, believing, hoping, longing for [the crown]; let us run, subjugating the body, doing alms cheerfully and heartily, —in giving kindnesses and forgiving injuries; [let us run,] praying that our strength may be helped as we run; and let us so listen to the commandments which urge us to perfection, as not to neglect running towards the fulness of charity.

CHAP. IX.—(20.) *Who may be said to walk without spot; damnable and venial sins.*

Having premised these remarks, let us carefully attend to the passages which he whom we are answering has produced, as we would ourselves have quoted them. "In Deuteronomy [it is written,] "Thou shalt be perfect before the Lord thy God."⁸ Again, in the same book, "There shall not be an im-

¹ *Mente*. The Septuagint, however, like the Hebrew, has *δύναμις*. A.V. "thy might." Comp. Deut. vi. 5 with Matt. xxii. 37.

² Carnaliter.

³ Rom. vii. 23.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 37.

⁵ See above in Augustine's *De Spiritu et Litera*, 64.

⁶ 1 Cor. ix. 23.

⁷ 1 Cor. ix. 24.

⁸ Deut. xviii. 13.

perfect man¹ among the sons of Israel.”² In like manner the Saviour says in the Gospel, “Be ye perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.”³ So the apostle, in his second Epistle to the Corinthians, says: “Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect.”⁴ Again, to the Colossians he writes: “Warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ.”⁵ And so to the Philippians: “Do all things without murmurings and disputings, that ye may be blameless, and harmless, as the immaculate sons of God.”⁶ In like manner to the Ephesians he writes: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ; according as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and blameless before Him.”⁷ Then again to the Colossians he says in another passage: “And you, that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death; [therefore] present yourselves⁸ holy and unblameable and unreprouvable in His sight.”⁹ In the same strain, he says to the Ephesians: “That He might present to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.”¹⁰ So in his first Epistle to the Corinthians he says: “Be ye sober, and righteous, and sin not.”¹¹ So again in the Epistle of St. Peter it is written: “Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end, for the grace that is offered to you: . . . as obedient children, not fashioning yourselves according to the former lusts in your ignorance: but as He who hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation; because it is written,¹² Be ye holy; for I am holy.”¹³ Whence blessed David likewise says: “O Lord, who shall sojourn in Thy tabernacle, or who shall

¹ Augustine's word is *inconsummatus*. The Septuagint term *τελειοκόμενος* (which properly signifies *complete, perfect*) comes to mean one *initiated* into the mysteries of idolatrous worship.

² Deut. xxiii. 17 (Sept.).

⁵ Col. i. 28.

⁸ Exhibete vos.

¹¹ 1 Cor. xv. 34.

³ Matt. v. 48.

⁶ Phil. ii. 14, 15.

⁹ Col. i. 21, 22.

¹² Lev. xix. 2.

⁴ 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

⁷ Eph. i. 3, 4.

¹⁰ Eph. v. 26, 27.

¹³ 1 Pet. i. 13-16.

rest on Thy holy mountain? He that walketh without blame, and worketh righteousness." ¹ And in another passage: "I shall be blameless with Him." ² And yet again: "Blessed are the blameless in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord." ³ To the same effect it is written in Solomon: "The Lord loveth holy hearts, and all they that are blameless are acceptable unto Him." ⁴ Now some of these passages exhort men who are running their course that they do it perfectly; others refer to the end thereof, that men may reach forward to it as they run. That man, however, is not unreasonably said to walk blamelessly, who has not yet indeed reached the end of his journey, but who is pressing on towards the end in a blameless manner, free from damnable sins, and at the same time not neglecting to cleanse by almsgiving such sins as are venial. For the way in which we walk, that is, the road by which we reach perfection, is cleansed by holy prayer. That, moreover, is a holy prayer in which we say in truth, "Forgive us, as we ourselves show forgiveness." ⁵ So that, as there is nothing censured when blame is not imputed, we may hold on our course to perfection without censure, in a word, blamelessly; and in this perfect state, when we arrive at it at last, we shall find that there is absolutely nothing which requires cleansing by forgiveness.

CHAP. X.—(21.) *To whom God's commandments are grievous; and to whom, not. Why Scripture says that God's commandments are not grievous; a commandment is a proof of the freedom of man's will; prayer is a proof of grace.*

He next quotes passages to show that God's commandments are not grievous. But who can be ignorant of the fact that, since the universal commandment is love (for "the end of the commandment is charity," ⁶ and "love is the fulfilling of the law" ⁷), whatever is accomplished by the operation of love, and not of fear, is not grievous? They, however, experience toil and labour in the commandments of God, who try to fulfil them by fearing. "But perfect love casteth out fear;" ⁸ and, in respect of the burden of the commandment, it

¹ Ps. xv. 1, 2.

⁴ Prov. xi. 20.

⁷ Rom. xiii. 10.

² Ps. xviii. 23 (Sept.).

⁵ Matt. vi. 12.

⁸ 1 John iv. 18.

³ Ps. cxix. 1 (Sept.).

⁶ 1 Tim. i. 8.

not only takes off the pressure of its heavy weight, but it actually lifts it up as if on wings. In order, however, that this charity may be possessed, even as far as it can possibly be possessed in the body of this death, the free exercise of our own will avails but little, unless it be helped by God's grace through our Lord Jesus Christ; for as it must again and again be stated, it is "shed abroad in our hearts," not by our own selves, but "by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."¹ And for no other reason does Holy Scripture insist on the truth that God's commandments are not grievous, than this, that the soul which finds them grievous may understand that it has not yet received those resources [of grace] which make the Lord's commandments to be such as they are commended to us as being, even gentle and pleasant; and that it may pray in the deep earnestness of sincerity to obtain the gift of a ready obedience.² For the man who says, "Let my heart be blameless [in Thy statutes;]"³ and, "Order Thou my steps according to Thy word: and let not any iniquity have dominion over me;"⁴ and, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven;"⁵ and, "Lead us not into temptation;"⁶ and other prayers of a like purport, which it would be too long to particularize, does in effect offer up a prayer for ability to keep God's commandments. Neither, indeed, on the one hand, would any injunctions be laid upon us to keep them, if our own will had not anything to do in the matter; nor, on the other hand, would there be any room for prayer, if our will were alone sufficient. God's commandments, therefore, are commended to us as being not grievous, in order that he to whom they are burdensome may understand that he has not as yet received the gift which removes their grievousness; and that he may not think that he is really performing them, when he so keeps them that they are grievous to him. For it is a cheerful giver whom God loves.⁷ Nevertheless, when a man finds God's commandments grievous, let him not be broken down by indulging despair; let him rather oblige himself to seek, to ask earnestly, and to knock [at mercy's gate for grace].

¹ Rom. v. 5.² Facilitatis.³ Ps. cxix. 80.⁴ Ps. cxix. 133.⁵ Matt. vi. 10.⁶ Matt. vi. 13.⁷ 2 Cor. ix. 7.

(22.) He afterwards adduces those passages which represent God as recommending His own commandments as not grievous: let us now attend to their testimony. "Because," says he, "God's commandments are not only not impossible, but they are not even grievous. In Deuteronomy [we read]: 'The Lord thy God will again turn and rejoice over thee for good, as He rejoiced over thy fathers, if ye shall hearken to the voice of the Lord your God, to keep His commandments, and His ordinances, and His judgments, written in the book of this law; if thou turn to the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul. For this command, which I give thee this day, is not grievous, neither is it far from thee: it is not in heaven, that thou shouldest say, Who will ascend into heaven, and obtain it for us, that we may hear and do it? neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldest say, Who will cross over the sea, and obtain it for us, that we may hear and do it? The word is close to thee, in thy mouth, and in thine heart, and in thine hands to do it.'¹ In the Gospel likewise the Lord says: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light.'² So also in the Epistle of Saint John it is written: 'This is the love of God, that we keep His commandments: and His commandments are not grievous.'³ After hearing these testimonies out of the law, and the gospel, and the epistles, let us edify ourselves for that grace which those persons do not understand, who, "being ignorant of God's righteousness, and wishing to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."⁴ Now, since they understand not the passage of Deuteronomy in the sense that the Apostle Paul quoted it,—that "with the heart men believe unto righteousness, and with their mouth make confession unto salvation;"⁵ since "they that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick,"⁶—they certainly ought (by that very passage of the Apostle John which he quoted last

¹ Deut. xxx. 9-14.² Matt. xi. 28-30.³ 1 John v. 3.⁴ Rom. x. 3.⁵ Rom. x. 10.⁶ Matt. ix. 12.

to this effect: "This is the love of God, that we keep His commandments; and His commandments are not grievous"¹) to be admonished that God's commandments are never burdensome to God's love, which is shed abroad in our hearts only by the Holy Ghost, not by the power of man's free will, by attributing to which more than they ought, they are ignorant of God's righteousness. This love, however, shall then be made perfect, when all slavish fear of punishment shall be cut off.

CHAP. XI.—(23.) *Passages of Scripture which, when objected against him by the Catholics, Celestius endeavours to elude by other passages: the first passage.*

After this he adduced the passages which are usually quoted against them. He does not attempt to meet these passages, but, by alleging what seem to be contrary statements, he has rendered his questions more difficult to solve.² "For," says he, "there are passages of Scripture which are to be alleged in opposition to those who ignorantly suppose that they are able to destroy the liberty of the will, or the possibility of not sinning, by the authority of Scripture. For," he adds, "they are in the habit of quoting against us what holy Job said: 'Who is pure from uncleanness? Not one; even if he be an infant of only one day upon the earth.'"³ Then he proceeds to give a sort of answer to this passage by help of other quotations; as when Job himself said: "For although I am a righteous and blameless man, I have become a subject for mockery,"⁴—not understanding that a man may be called righteous, who has gone so far towards perfection in righteousness as to be very near it; and this we do not deny to have been in the power of many even in this life, when they walk in it by faith.

(24.) *To be without sin, and to be without blame—how differing.*

The same thing is affirmed in another passage, which he has quoted immediately afterwards, as spoken by the same Job: "Behold, I am very near my judgment, and I know that I shall be found righteous."⁵ Now this is the judgment of which it is said in another scripture: "And He shall bring forth thy righteousness as the light, and thy judgment as the

¹ 1 John v. 3.

³ Job xiv. 4, 5 (Sept.).

² *Questiones arctius illigavit.*

⁴ Job xii. 4 (Sept.).

⁵ Job xiii. 18 (Sept.).

noonday." But he does not say, I am already there; but, "I am very near." If, indeed, the judgment of his which he meant was not that which he would himself exercise, but that whereby he was to be judged at the last day, then in such judgment all will be found righteous who with sincerity pray: "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."¹ For it is through this forgiveness that they will be found righteous; on this account that whatever sins they have here incurred, they have blotted out by their deeds of charity. Whence the Lord says: "Give alms [of such things as ye have]; and, behold, all things are clean unto you."² For by and by it shall be said to the righteous, when about to enter into their promised kingdom: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat,"³ and so forth. However, it is one thing to be in this life without sin, which could only be predicated of the Only-begotten, and another thing to be without censure, which might be said of many just persons even in the present life; for there is a certain criterion of a good man's life, according to which even in our human conversation there could no just blame be possibly laid against him. For who can fairly find fault with the man who harbours no ill-will against any, and who faithfully does good to all he can, and never cherishes a wish to avenge himself on any man who does him wrong, so that he can truly say, "As we forgive our debtors?" And yet by the very fact that he truly says, "Forgive, as we also forgive," he plainly admits that he is not without sin.

(25.) Hence the force of [Job's] statement: "There was no injustice in my hands, but my prayer was pure."⁴ For the purity of his prayer arose from this circumstance, that it was not improper for him to ask forgiveness in prayer, when he really bestowed forgiveness himself.

(26.) *Why Job was so great a sufferer.*

And when he says concerning the Lord, "For many bruises hath He inflicted upon me without a cause,"⁵ observe that his words are not, He hath inflicted *none with a cause*; but,

¹ Matt. vi. 12.

² Luke xi. 41.

³ Matt. xxv. 35.

⁴ Job xvi. 18 (Sept.).

⁵ Job ix. 17.

“many without a cause.” For it was not because of his manifold sins that these many bruises were inflicted on him, but in order to make trial of his patience. In respect of his sins, indeed, while acknowledging in another passage that he was certainly not free from them, he yet judges that he ought to have suffered less.

(27.) *Who may be said to keep the ways of the Lord ; what it is to decline and depart from the ways of the Lord.*

Then again, as for what [Job] says, “For I have kept His ways, and have not turned aside from His commandments, nor will I depart from them,”¹ [let us remember that] he keeps God’s ways who does not so turn aside as to forsake them, but makes progress by running his course therein ; although, weak as he is, he sometimes stumbles or falls, onward, however, he still goes, sinning less and less until he reaches the perfect state in which he will sin no more. For in no other way could he make progress, except by keeping God’s commandments. The man, indeed, who declines from these, and becomes an apostate at last, is certainly not he who, although he has sin, yet never ceases to persevere in fighting against it, until he arrives at the home where there shall remain no more conflict with death. Well now, it is in our present struggle therewith that we are clothed with the righteousness in which we here live by faith,—clothed with it as it were with a breastplate.² Judgment also we take on ourselves ; and even when it is against us, we turn it round to our own behalf ; for we become our own accusers and condemn our sins : whence that scripture which says, “The righteous man accuses himself at the beginning of his speech.”³ Hence also [Job] says : “I put on righteousness, and clothed myself with judgment like a mantle.”⁴ Our vesture at present no doubt is wont to be armour for war rather than garments of peace, while concupiscence has still to be subdued ; it will be different by and by, when our last enemy death shall be destroyed,⁵ and our righteousness shall be full and complete, without an enemy to molest us more.

¹ Job xxiii. 11, 12 (Sept.).

² Eph. vi. 14.

³ Prov. xviii. 17 (Sept.).

⁴ Job xxix. 14 (Sept.).

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 26.

(28.) *When our heart may be said not to reproach us ; when good is to be perfected.*

Furthermore, concerning these words of Job, "My heart shall not reproach me so long as I live,"¹ [we remark,] that it is in this present life of ours, in which we live by faith, that our heart does not reproach us, when the same faith whereby we believe unto righteousness does not neglect to rebuke our sin. On this principle the apostle says: "The good that I would I do not ; but the evil which I would not, that I do."² Now it is a good thing to avoid concupiscence, and this good the just man would do, who lives by faith ;³ and still he does what he hates, because he indulges concupiscence, although "he goes not after his lusts,"⁴ which if he has ever done, he has himself really done it at the moment, so as to yield to, and acquiesce in, and obey the desire of sin. His heart then reproaches him, because it is even *it*, and not his sin which dwelleth in him, that is the rebuker. But whensoever he suffers not sin to reign in his mortal body to obey it in the lusts thereof,⁵ and yields not his members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin,⁶ sin no doubt is inherent in his members, but it does not reign, because its desires are not obeyed. Therefore, while he does that which he would not,—in other words, while he wishes not to lust, but still lusts,—he consents to the law that it is good :⁷ for what the law would, that he also wishes ; because it is his desire not to indulge concupiscence, and the law expressly says, "Thou shalt not covet."⁸ Now in that he wishes what the law also would have done, he no doubt consents to the law : but still he lusts, because he is not without sin ; it is, however, no longer himself that does the thing, but the sin which dwells within him. Hence it is that "his heart does not reproach him so long as he lives ;" that is, so long as he has faith, because the just man lives by faith, so that his faith is his very life. He knows, to be sure, that in himself dwells nothing good,—even in his flesh, which is the dwelling-place of sin. By not consenting, however, to it, he lives by faith, wherewith he also calls upon God to help him in his contest

¹ Job xxvii. 6.² Rom. vii. 15.³ Hab. ii. 4.⁴ Eccles. xviii. 30.⁵ Rom. vi. 12.⁶ Rom. vi. 13.⁷ Rom. vii. 16.⁸ Ex. xx. 17.

against sin. Moreover, there is present to him the will that no sin at all should be in him, but then how to carry out this good wish is beyond his present power. It is not the mere doing of a good thing that is not present to him, but the perfect accomplishment of it. For in the fact that he yields no consent [to evil,] he does a good thing; he does good again, when he hates his own lust; he does good also, in not ceasing to give alms; whenever, too, he forgives the man who sins against him, he does a good thing; in the very fact, moreover, of his asking forgiveness for his own trespasses,—sincerely avowing in his petition that he also forgives those who trespass against himself, and praying that he may not be led into temptation, but be delivered from evil,—he does a good thing. But how to give full effect to the good is not in his present power; it will be, however, in that final state, when the concupiscence which dwells in his members shall exist no more. His heart, therefore, does not reproach *him*, when it reprehends the sin which dwells in his members; nor has it the unbelief which it censures in him. Thus “so long as he lives,”—that is, so long as he has faith,—he is neither reproached by his own heart, nor convinced of not being without sin. And Job himself acknowledges as much as this concerning himself, when he says, “Not one of my sins hath escaped Thee; Thou hast sealed up my transgressions in a bag, and marked if I have done iniquity unawares.”¹ With regard, then, to the passages which he has adduced from the book of holy Job, we have shown to the best of our ability in what sense they ought to be taken. He, however, has failed to explain the meaning of the words which he has himself quoted from the same Job: “Who then is pure from uncleanness? Not one; even if he be an infant of only one day upon the earth.”²

CHAP. XII.—(29.) *The second passage. Who may be said to abstain from every evil thing.*

“They are in the habit of next quoting,” says he, “the passage: ‘Every man is a liar.’”³ But here again he offers no solution of words which are quoted against himself even by himself; all he does is to mention other apparently opposite passages before persons who are unacquainted with

¹ Job xiv. 16, 17.

² Job xiv. 4, 5 (Sept.).

³ Ps. cxv. 2 (Sept.).

the sacred Scriptures, and thus to divide the word of God contentiously. This is what he says: "We tell them in answer, how in the book of Numbers it is said, 'Man is true.'¹ While of holy Job this eulogy is read: 'There was a certain man in the land of Ausis, whose name was Job; that man was true, blameless, righteous, and godly, abstaining from every evil thing.'² I am surprised that he has brought forward this passage, which says that Job "abstained from every evil thing," wishing it to mean "abstained from every sin;" because he has argued already³ that sin is not a real thing, but an act. He should recollect that, even if it is an act, it may still be called a real thing. That man, however, abstains from every evil thing, who either never consents to the sin, which is always with him, or, if sometimes hard pressed by it, is never oppressed by it; just as the wrestling champion, who, although he is sometimes caught in a fierce grapple, does not for all that lose the prowess which constitutes him the better man. We read, indeed, of a blameless man, of one who deserves no censure; but we never read of a sinless man, except in the case of the Son of man, who is also the only-begotten Son of God.

(30.) "*Every man is a liar,*" owing to himself alone; but "*every man is true,*" by help only of the grace of God.

"Moreover," says he, "in Job himself it is said: 'And he maintained the wonderful character of a true man.'⁴ Again we read in Solomon, touching wisdom: 'Men that are liars cannot remember her, but men of truth shall be found in her.'⁵ Again in the Apocalypse: 'And in their mouth was found no guile, for they are without fault.'⁶ To all these statements we reply with an admonition to our opponents, how that a man (who is, owing to himself no doubt, a liar) can only be called true when instructed by the grace and truth of God. Whence it is said: "Every man is a liar."⁷

¹ If this refer to Num. xxiv. 3, 15 (as the editions mark it), the quotation is most inexact. The Septuagint words *ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ ἀληθινῶς ὄρων* is not a proposition equal to "*homo verax,*" as an antithesis to the proposition "*omnis homo mendax.*"

² Job i. 1 (Sept.).

³ See above, (1.)

⁴ Et miraculum tenuit veracis hominis. [We cannot verify this quotation.]

⁵ Ecclus. xv. 8 [for the first clause]. ⁶ Rev. xiv. 5. ⁷ Ps. cxv. 2 (Sept.).

As for the passage also which he has quoted in reference to wisdom, when it is said, "Men of truth shall be found in her," we must observe that it is undoubtedly not "*in her*," but *in themselves* that men shall be found liars. Just as the case stands in respect of another passage: "Ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord."¹ When [the apostle, in the former clause,] said, "Ye were darkness," he did not add, "in the Lord;" [in the latter clause,] however, after saying, "Ye are now light," he expressly added the phrase, "in the Lord," for they could not possibly be "light" in themselves; "he therefore who glorieth must glory in the Lord."² The "faultless" ones, indeed, in the Apocalypse, are so called because "no guile was found in their mouth."³ They did not say they had no sin: if they had made such a pretension, they would deceive themselves, and the truth would not be in them;⁴ and if the truth were not in them, guile and untruth would be found in their mouth. If, however, to avoid odium, they said they were not without sin, although they were sinless, then this very insincerity would be a lie, and the character given of them would be untrue: "In their mouth was found no guile [or lie]." Hence indeed "they are without fault;" for as they have forgiven those who have done them wrong, so are they purified by God's forgiveness of themselves. Observe now how we have to the best of our power explained in what sense the quotations he has in his own behalf advanced ought to be understood. But how the passage, "Every man is a liar," is to be interpreted, he on his part has altogether omitted to explain; nor is an explanation within his power, without a correction of the error which makes him believe that man can be true without the help of God's grace, and merely by virtue of his own free will.

CHAP. XIII.—(31.) *The third passage. It is one thing to depart, and another thing to have departed, from all sin. "There is none that doeth good,"—of whom this is to be understood.*

He accordingly propounded another question, as we shall proceed to show; but he failed to solve it, nay, he rather rendered it more complex and difficult, by first stating the

¹ Eph. v. 8.² 1 Cor. i. 31.³ Rev. xiv. 5.⁴ 1 John i. 8.

testimony that had been quoted against him: "There is none that doeth good, no, not one;"¹ and then resorting to seemingly contrary passages to show that there are persons who do good. This he succeeded, no doubt, in doing. It is, however, one thing for a man not to do good, and another thing not to be without sin, although he at the same time may do many good things. The passages, therefore, which he adduces are not really contrary to the statement that no person is without sin in this life. He does not, for his own part, explain in what sense it is declared that "there is none that doeth good, no, not one." These are his words: "Holy David indeed says, 'Hope thou in the Lord and be doing good.'"² But this is a precept, and not an accomplished fact; and such a precept as is never kept by those of whom it is said, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." He adds: "Holy Tobit also said, 'Fear not, my son, that we have to endure poverty; we shall have many blessings if we fear God, and depart from all sin, and do that which is good.'"³ Most true indeed it is, that man shall have many blessings when he shall have departed from all sin. Then no evil shall betide him; nor shall he have need of the prayer, "Deliver us from evil."⁴ Although even now every man who progresses [in spiritual life,] advancing ever with an upright purpose, departs from all sin, and becomes further removed from it as he approaches nearer to the fulness and perfection of the righteous state; because even concupiscence itself, which is sin dwelling in our flesh, never ceases to diminish in progressing [Christians,] although it still remains in their mortal members. It is one thing, therefore, to depart from all sin,—a process which is even now in operation,—and another thing to have departed from all sin, which shall happen in the state of future perfection. But still, even he who has departed already from evil, and is continuing to do so, must be allowed to be a doer of good. How then is it said, in the passage which he has quoted and left unsolved, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one," except that the Psalmist there censures some one nation, amongst whom there was not a man that did good, wishing to remain "children of men," and not sons of God, by

¹ Ps. xiv. 3.² Ps. xxxvii. 3.³ Tobit iv. 21.⁴ Matt. vi. 13.

whose grace man becomes good, in order to do good? For we must suppose the Psalmist here to mean that "good" which he describes in the context, saying, "God looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God."¹ Such good then as this, seeking after God, there was not a man found who pursued it, no, not one; but this was in that class of men which is predestinated to destruction.² It was upon such that God looked down in His foreknowledge and passed sentence.

CHAP. XIV.—(32.) *The fourth passage. In what sense God only is good. With God to be good and to be Himself are the same thing.*

"They likewise," says he, "quote what the Saviour says: 'Why callest thou me good? There is none good save one, that is, God?'"³ This quotation, however, he makes no attempt whatever to explain; all he does is to oppose to it sundry other passages which seem to contradict it. These he adduces to show that man is good. Here are his remarks: "We must answer this text with another, in which the same Lord says, 'A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things.'⁴ And again: 'He maketh His sun to rise on the good and on the evil.'⁵ Then in another passage it is written, 'For the good things are created from the beginning,'⁶ and yet again, 'They that are good shall dwell in the land.'⁷ Now to all this we must say in answer, that the passage in question must be understood in the same sense as the former one, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one," either because all created things, although God made them very good, are yet, when compared with their Creator,

¹ Ps. xiv. 2.

² On this passage Fulgentius remarks (*Ad Monimum*, i. 5): "In no other sense do I suppose that passage of St. Augustine should be taken, in which he affirms that there are certain persons predestinated to destruction, than in regard to their punishment, not their sin. [That is to say, their predestination is] not to the evil which they unrighteously commit, but to the punishment which they shall righteously suffer; not to the sin on account of which they either do not receive, or else lose, the benefit of the first resurrection, but to the retribution which their own personal iniquity evilly incurs, and the divine justice righteously inflicts."

³ Luke xviii. 19.

⁴ Matt. xii. 35.

⁵ Matt. v. 45.

⁶ Ecclus. xxxix. 25.

⁷ Prov. ii. 21.

not good, being in fact incapable of any comparison with Him. For in a transcendent, and yet very proper sense, He said of Himself, "I AM THAT I AM."¹ The statement therefore before us, "None is good save one, that is, God," is used in some such way as that which is said of John, "He was not that light;"² although the Lord calls him "a light,"³ [or "lamp,"⁴] just as he He says to His disciples: "Ye are the light of the world: . . . neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel."⁵ Still, in comparison with that light which is "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,"⁶ he was not light. Or else, because the very sons of God even, when compared with themselves as they shall hereafter become in their eternal perfection, [have only a qualified goodness,] are good in such a way as still to remain evil. Although I should not have dared to say this of them (for who would be so bold as to call them evil who have God for their Father?) unless the Lord had Himself said: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask Him?"⁷ Of course, by applying to them the words, "your Father," He proved that they were already sons of God; and yet at the same time He did not hesitate to say that they were "evil." Your author, however, does not explain to us how they [whose eulogies he quotes] are good, whilst yet "there is none good save one, that is, God." Accordingly the man who asked [the Lord] "what good thing he was to do,"⁸ was admonished to seek Him⁹ by whose grace he might become good; to whom also *to be good* is nothing else than *to be Himself*, because He is unchangeably good, and cannot be evil at all.

(33.) *The fifth passage.*¹⁰

"This," says he, "is another text of theirs: 'Who will boast that he has a pure heart?'"¹¹ And then he produced his answer thereto out of several passages, wishing to show that there may be in man a pure heart. But he omits to

¹ Ex. iii. 14.

⁴ [The word is *λύχνος*, not *φῶς*.]

⁷ Matt. vii. 11.

¹⁰ See also his work *Contra Julianum*, ii. 8.

² John i. 8.

⁵ Matt. v. 14, 15.

⁸ Matt. xix. 16.

³ John v. 35.

⁶ John i. 9.

⁹ Luke x. 27, 23.

¹¹ Prov. xx. 9.

inform us how the passage which he paraded as quoted against himself must be taken, so as to prevent Holy Scripture seeming to be opposed to itself in this text, and in the passages which comprise his answer. We for our part indeed tell him, in answer to all his allegation, that the clause, "Who will boast that he has a pure heart?" is a suitable sequel to the preceding sentence, "whenever a righteous king sits upon the throne."¹ For how great soever a man's righteousness may be, he ought to reflect and think, lest there should be found something blameworthy, which has escaped indeed his own notice, when that righteous King shall sit upon His throne, whose cognizance no sins can possibly escape, not even those of which it is said, "Who understandeth his transgressions?"² "When, therefore, the righteous King shall sit upon His throne, . . . who will boast that he has a pure heart? or who will boldly say that he is pure from sin?"³ Not one, except perhaps those who wish to boast of their own righteousness, and not glory in the compassions of the Judge Himself.

CHAP. XV.—(34.)

And yet the passages are true which he goes on to adduce by way of answer. This is what he says: "The Saviour in the gospel declares, 'Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.'⁴ David also says, 'Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that is innocent in his hands, and pure in his heart;'⁵ and again in another passage, 'Do good, O Lord, unto those that be good and upright in heart.'⁶ So also in Solomon [it is written,] 'Riches are good unto him that hath no sin [on his conscience];'⁷ and again in the same book, 'Leave off from sin, and order thine hands aright, and cleanse thy heart from wickedness.'⁸ So in the Epistle of John, 'If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God; and whatsoever we ask, we shall receive of Him.'⁹ For all this is accomplished in us when we have the will, by the exercise of faith, hope, and charity; by keeping under the body; by doing

¹ Prov. xx. 8.² Ps. xix. 12.³ Prov. xx. 8, 9.⁴ Matt. v. 8.⁵ Ps. xxiv. 3, 4.⁶ Ps. cxxv. 4.⁷ Eccles. xiii. 24.⁸ Eccles. xxxviii. 10.⁹ 1 John iii. 21, 22.

alms; by forgiving injuries; by earnest prayer; by supplicating for strength to advance in our course; by sincerely saying, "Forgive us, as we also forgive others," and "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."¹ By this process, [I say,] it is certainly brought about that our heart is cleansed, and all our sin taken away; and what the righteous King, when sitting on His throne, shall find concealed in the heart and uncleansed as yet, shall be remitted by His mercy, so that the whole shall be rendered sound and cleansed for seeing God. For "he shall have judgment without mercy, that hath showed no mercy: yet mercy triumpheth against judgment."² If it were not so, what hope could any of us have? "When, indeed, the righteous King shall sit upon His throne, who shall boast that he hath a pure heart, or who shall boldly say that he is pure from sin?" Then, however, through His mercy shall the righteous, being by that time fully and perfectly cleansed, shine forth like the glorious sun in the kingdom of their Father.³

(35.) *The Church will be without spot and wrinkle after the resurrection.*

Then shall the Church realize, in a full and perfect degree, the condition of "not having spot, or any such thing,"⁴ because then also will it in a real sense be glorious. For inasmuch as he added the epithet "glorious," when he said, "That He might present the Church to Himself, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing," [it follows that it shall] then be spotless when it shall be glorious. Because it is not so much when the Church is involved in so many evils [as now befall it,] or amidst such offences, and in so great a mixture of evil of very evil men, and amidst the heavy reproaches of the ungodly, that we ought to say that it is glorious, from the fact that kings serve it,—a fact which only produces a more perilous and a sorer temptation,—but that its glory shall rather then arise, when that event shall come to pass of which the apostle also speaks in the words, "When Christ, who is your life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory."⁵ For since the Lord Himself, in that form of a ser-

¹ Matt. vi. 12, 13.

² Jas. ii. 13.

³ Matt. xiii. 43.

⁴ Eph. v. 27.

⁵ Col. iii. 4.

vant by means of which He united Himself as Mediator to the Church, was not glorified without the glory of His resurrection (whence the statement, "The Spirit was not yet given, because Christ was not yet glorified"¹), how shall His Church be described as *glorious*, previous to its resurrection? He cleanses it, therefore, now "by the laver of the water in the word,"² washing away its past sins, and driving off from it the dominion of wicked angels; but then by bringing all its healthy powers to perfection, He makes it meet for that glorious state, where it shall shine without a spot or wrinkle. For "whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified."³ It was under this mystery, as I suppose, that that [remarkable word of His] was spoken, "Behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures to-day and to-morrow, and the third day I shall be consummated or perfected."⁴ For He said this in the person of His body, which is His Church, putting *days* for distinct and appointed periods, whilst He also signified on "the third day" [the perfection which should accrue to Him] in His resurrection.

(36.) *The difference between the upright in heart and the clean in heart.*

I suppose, too, that there is a difference between one who is upright in heart and one who is clean in heart. A man is upright in heart when he "reaches forward to those things which are before, forgetting those things which are behind,"⁵ so as to arrive in* a right course, that is, with right faith and purpose, at the perfection where he may dwell clean and pure in heart. Thus, in the psalm, the conditions ought to be severally bestowed on each separate character, where it is said, "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord? or who shall stand in His holy place? He that is innocent in his hands, and pure [or clean] in his heart."⁶ He shall ascend, innocent in his hands, and stand, clean in his heart,—the one state in present operation, the other in its consummation. And of them should rather be understood that which is written:

¹ John vii. 39.

² Eph. v. 26. [The phrase is *lavacro aquæ* = τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος.]

³ Rom. viii. 30.

⁴ Luke xiii. 32.

⁵ Phil. iii. 13.

⁶ Ps. xxiv. 3, 4.

“Riches are good unto him that hath no sin [on his conscience.”¹] Then indeed shall accrue the good, or true riches, when all poverty shall have passed away; in other words, when all infirmity shall have been removed. A man may now indeed “leave off from sin,” when in his onward course he departs from it, and is renewed day by day; and he may “order his hands,” and direct them to works of mercy, and “cleanse his heart from all wickedness,”² [and] be so merciful that what remains may be forgiven him by free pardon. This indeed is the sound and suitable meaning, without any vain and empty boasting, of that which St. John said: “If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we shall receive of Him.”³ The warning which he clearly has addressed to us in this passage, is to beware lest our heart should reproach us in our very prayers and petitions; that is to say, lest, when we happen to resort to this prayer, and say, “Forgive us, even as we ourselves forgive,” we should have to feel compunction for not doing what we say, or should even lose boldness to utter what we fail to do, and thereby forfeit the confidence of faithful and earnest prayer.

CHAP. XVI.—(37.) *The sixth passage.*

He has also adduced this passage of Scripture, which is very commonly quoted against his party: “For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.”⁴ And he makes a pretence of answering it by other passages,—how, [for instance,] the Lord says concerning holy Job, “Hast thou considered my servant Job? For there is none like him upon earth, a man who is blameless, true, a worshipper of God, and abstaining from every evil thing.”⁵ On this passage we have already made some remarks.⁶ But even he has not attempted to show us how, on the one hand, Job was absolutely sinless upon earth,—if the words are to bear such a sense; and, on the other hand, how that can be true which he has admitted to be in the Scripture, “There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not.”⁷

¹ Ecclus. xiii. 24

² Ecclus. xxxviii. 10.

³ John iii. 21, 22.

⁴ Eccles. vii. 20.

⁵ Job i. 8 (Sept.).

⁶ See above, ch. xii. (29.)

⁷ Eccles. vii. 20.

CHAP. XVII.—(38.) *The seventh passage. Who may be called immaculate. How it is that in God's sight no man is justified.*

“They also,” says he, “quote the text: ‘For in thy sight shall no man living be justified.’”¹ And his affected answer to this passage amounts to nothing else than the showing how texts of Holy Scripture seem to clash with one another, whereas it is our duty rather to demonstrate their agreement. These are his words: “We must confront them with this answer, from the testimony of the evangelist concerning holy Zacharias and Elisabeth, when he says, ‘And they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.’”² Now both these righteous persons had, of course, read amongst these very commandments the prescribed method of cleansing their own sins. For, according to what is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews of ‘every high priest taken from among men,’³ Zacharias used no doubt to offer sacrifices even for his own sins.” The meaning, however, of the phrase “*blameless*,” which is applied to him, we have already, as I suppose, sufficiently explained.⁴ “And,” he adds, “the blessed apostle says, ‘That we should be holy, and without blame before Him.’”⁵ This, according to him, means that we should be so, if those persons are to be understood by “*blameless*” who are altogether without sin. If, however, they are “*blameless*” who are without blame or censure, then it is impossible for us to deny that there have been, and still are, such persons even in this present life; for it does not follow that a man is without sin because he has not a blot of censure. Accordingly the apostle, when selecting ministers for ordination, does not say, “If any be *sinless*,” for he would be unable to find any such; but he says, “If any be *blameless*,”⁶ for such, of course, he would be able to find. But our opponent does not tell us how, in accordance with his views, we ought to understand the scripture, “For in Thy sight shall no man living be justified.”⁷ The meaning of these words is plain enough, receiving as it does additional light from the preceding clause: “Enter not,” says the Psalmist, “into judgment with Thy servant, [O Lord,] for in Thy sight

¹ Ps. cxliii. 2.² Luke i. 6.³ Heb. v. 1.⁴ See above, ch. xi. (23).⁵ Eph. i. 4.⁶ Tit. i. 6.⁷ Ps. cxliii. 2.

shall no man living be justified." It is judgment which he fears, therefore he desires that mercy which triumphs over judgment.¹ For the meaning of the prayer, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant," is this: Judge me not according to Thine own attribute, who art without sin; "for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified." This without doubt is understood as spoken of the present life, whilst the predicate "shall not be justified" has reference to that perfect state of righteousness which belongs not to this life.

CHAP. XVIII.—(39.) *The eighth passage. In what sense he is said not to sin who is born of God. In what way he who sins shall not see nor know God.*

"They also quote," says he, "this passage, 'If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.'"² And this very clear testimony he has endeavoured to meet with apparently contradictory texts, saying thus: "The same St. John in this very epistle says, 'This, however, brethren, I enjoin on you, that ye sin not. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin.'³ Also elsewhere: 'Whosoever is born of God sinneth not; because his being born of God preserveth him, and the evil one toucheth him not.'⁴ And again in another passage, when speaking of the Saviour, he says: 'Since He was manifested to take away sins, whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither known Him.'⁵ And yet again: 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope towards Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure.'⁶ And yet, notwithstanding the truth of all these passages, that also is true which he has adduced, without, however, offering any explanation of it: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."⁷ Now it follows from the whole of this, that in so far as we are born of God we abide in Him who appeared to take away sins, that is, in Christ, and therefore sin not, which implies that "the inward man is renewed day by day;"⁸ but in so far as we are born

¹ Jas. ii. 13.

² 1 John i. 8.

³ 1 John iii. 9.

⁴ 1 John v. 18.

⁵ 1 John iii. 5, 6.

⁶ 1 John iii. 2, 3.

⁷ 1 John i. 8.

⁸ 2 Cor. iv. 16.

of that man "through whom sin entered into the world, and death by sin, whereby death passed upon all men,"¹ we are not without sin, because we are not as yet freed from his infirmity, [nor indeed shall be,] until by that renewal which takes place from day to day (for it is in accordance with this very [renovation] that we were born of God), that infirmity shall be wholly repaired, wherein we were born after the first man, and in which we are not without sin. Now, while the remains of this infirmity abide in our inward man (for they still continue in us, however much they may be daily lessened in those who are advancing [in the Christian course]), "we deceive ourselves, and have not the truth in us, if we say that we have no sin." Now, however true it is that "whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, nor known Him"² (for in respect of the vision and knowledge, which shall be realized in actual sight by and by, no one can in this life see and know Him), yet in respect of the vision and knowledge which come of faith, there may be many who commit sin,—actual apostates, at any rate,—who still have believed in Him some time or other; so that of none of these could it be said, according to the vision and knowledge which still come of faith, that he has neither seen Him nor known Him. But I suppose it ought to be understood that it is the renewal which awaits perfection that sees and knows Him; whereas the infirmity which is destined to waste and ruin neither sees nor knows Him. And it is owing to the remains of this infirmity, of whatever amount, which remain firm in our inward man, that "we deceive ourselves, and have not the truth in us, when we say that we have no sin." Although, then, by the grace of renovation "we are the sons of God," yet by reason of the remains of infirmity within us "it doth not appear what we shall be; only we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is." Then there shall be no more sin, because no infirmity shall any longer remain within us or without us. "And every man that hath this hope towards Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure,"—purifieth himself, not indeed by himself simply, but by believing in Him, and calling on Him who sanctifieth His

¹ Rom. v. 12.

² 1 John iii. 6.

saints ; which sanctification, when perfected at last (for it is at present only advancing and growing day by day), shall take away from us for ever all the remains of our infirm condition.

CHAP. XIX.—(40.) *The ninth passage.*

“This passage, too,” says he, “is quoted by them: ‘It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.’”¹ And he observes that the answer to be given to them is derived from the same apostle’s words in another passage: “Let him do what he will.”² And he adds another passage from the Epistle to Philemon, where, speaking of Onesimus, [St. Paul says]: “Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel. But without thy mind would I do nothing; that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly.”³ “Likewise,” [continues he, we read] “in Deuteronomy: ‘Life and death hath He set before thee, and good and evil: . . . choose thou life, that thou mayest live.’”⁴ So in the book of Solomon: ‘God from the beginning made man, and left him in the hand of His counsel; and He added for him commandments and precepts: the precepts, if thou wilt, shall save thee, and [make thee] perform acceptable faithfulness for the time to come. He hath set fire and water before thee: stretch forth thine hand unto whether thou wilt. Before man are good and evil, and life and death; poverty and honour are from the Lord God.’”⁵ So again in Isaiah we read: ‘If ye be willing, and hearken unto me, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye be not willing, and hearken not to me, the sword shall devour you: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken this.’”⁶ Now with all their efforts of disguise they here betray their purpose; for they plainly attempt to controvert the grace and mercy of God, which we desire to obtain whenever we offer the prayer, “Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven;”⁷ or again this, “Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.”⁸ For indeed why do we present such petitions in earnest supplication, if the result is of him that willeth, and him that runneth, but not of God that showeth mercy? Not that the result is quite independent of

¹ Rom. ix. 16.

² 1 Cor. vii. 36.

³ Philem. 13, 14.

⁴ Deut. xxx. 15, 19.

⁶ Eccles. xv. 14-17.

⁶ Isa. i. 19, 20.

⁷ Matt. vi. 10.

⁸ Matt. vi. 13.

our will, but that our will does not accomplish its aims in action, unless it receive the divine assistance. Now the wholesome effect of faith is this, that it makes us "seek, that we may find; ask, that we may receive; and knock, that it may be opened to us."¹ Whereas the man who gainsays it, does really shut the door of God's mercy against himself. I am unwilling to say more touching so important a matter, because I do better in committing it to the deep sighing of the faithful, than in enlarging on it in words of my own.

(41.) But I beg of you to see, what after all is the small amount of his objection, that to him who "willeth and runneth" there is no necessity for God's mercy, which actually prevents him, in order that he may run,—because, forsooth, the apostle says concerning a certain person, "Let him do what he will,"² in the matter, I suppose, which he goes on to treat, when he says, "He sinneth not, let him marry;"³ as if indeed it should be regarded as a great matter to be willing to marry, when the subject is a laboured discussion concerning the assistance of God's grace. Well, then, [I suppose] even in this case to have a will is of considerable advantage, even if God's providence, which governs all things, does not join together the man and the woman! So again, [I suppose it is] in the case of the apostle's writing to Philemon, that "his kindness should not be as it were of necessity, but voluntary,"—as if any good act could indeed be voluntary otherwise than by God's "working in us both to will and to do of His own good pleasure."⁴ So again, when the Scripture says in Deuteronomy, "Life and death hath He set before man, and good and evil," and admonishes him "to choose life;" as if, forsooth, this very admonition did not come from God's mercy, or as if there were any advantage in choosing life, unless God inspired love to make such a choice, and it were better to have it as the object of our choice. On this point it is said: "For anger is in His indignation, and in His pleasure is life."⁵

Or again, because it is said, "The commandments, if thou wilt, shall save thee,"⁶—as if a man ought not to thank God,

¹ Luke xi. 9.² 1 Cor. vii. 36.³ 1 Cor. vii. 36.⁴ Phil. ii. 13.⁵ Ps. xxx. 5.⁶ Ecclus. xv. 15.

because he has a will to keep the commandments, since, if he wholly lacked the light of truth, it would not be possible for him to possess such a will. "Fire and water being set before him, a man stretches forth his hand towards which he pleases;"¹ and yet higher is He who calls man to his higher vocation than any thought on man's own part, inasmuch as the beginning of correction of the heart lies in faith, even as it is written, "Thou shalt come, and pass on from the beginning of faith."² Every one makes his choice of good, "according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith;"³ and as the Prince of faith says, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him."⁴ And that He spake this in reference to the faith which believes in Him, He subsequently explains with sufficient clearness, when He says: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life; yet there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him. And He said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father."⁵

(12.) *God's promises conditional. Saints of the Old Testament were saved by the grace of Christ.*

He, however, thought he had discovered a great support for his cause in the prophet Isaiah; because by him God said: "If ye be willing, and hearken unto me, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye be not willing, and hearken not to me, the sword shall devour you: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken this."⁶ As if the entire law were not full of conditions of this sort; or as if its commandments had been given to proud men for any other reason than that "the law was added because of transgression, until the seed should come to whom the promise was made."⁷ "It entered, therefore, that the offence might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound."⁸ In other words, That man might receive commandments, trusting as he did in his own resources, and that, failing in these and becoming a transgressor, he might ask for a deliverer and a saviour; and that

¹ Ecclus. xv. 16.

² Cant. iv. 8 (Sept.).

³ Rom. xii. 3.

⁴ John vi. 44.

⁵ John vi. 62-65.

⁶ Isa. i. 19, 20.

⁷ Gal. iii. 19.

⁸ Rom. v. 20.

the law by its fear might humble him, and bring him, as a schoolmaster, to faith and grace. Thus "their weaknesses being multiplied, they hastened" [after the Saviour];¹ and in order to heal them, Christ in due season came. In His grace even righteous men of old believed, and by the same grace were they holpen; so that with joy did they receive a foreknowledge of Him, and some of them even foretold His coming,—whether they were found among the people of Israel themselves, as Moses, and Joshua the son of Nun, and Samuel, and David, and such-like worthies; or outside that people, as Job; or previous to their formation, as Abraham, and Noah, and all others either mentioned in Holy Scripture or tacitly assumed therein. "For there is but one God, and one only Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,"² without whose grace nobody is delivered from condemnation, whether he has derived that condemnation from him in whom all men sinned, or has afterwards aggravated it by his own iniquities.

CHAP. XX.—(43.) *No man is assisted unless he does himself also work. Our course is a constant progress.*

But what is the import of the last statement which he has made: "If any one say, 'It may possibly be that a man sin not even in word,' then the answer," says he, "which must be given is, 'Quite possible, if God so will; and God does so will, therefore it is possible.'" See how unwilling he was to say, "If God give His help, then it would be possible;" and yet the Psalmist thus addresses God: "Be Thou my helper, forsake me not;"³ where of course help is not sought for procuring bodily advantages and avoiding bodily evils, but for practising and fulfilling righteousness. Hence it is that we say: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."⁴ Now no man is assisted [by God,] unless he also himself does something; assisted, however, he is, if he prays, if he believes, if he is "called according to God's purpose;"⁵ for "whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the first-born among many brethren, Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them

¹ Ps. xvi. 4 (Sept.).

² 1 Tim. ii. 5.

³ Ps. xxvii. 9.

⁴ Matt. vi. 13.

⁵ Rom. viii. 28.

He also called ; and whom He called, them He also justified ; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.”¹ We run, therefore, whenever we make advance ; and our healthy condition keeps pace with us in this onward course (just as a sore is said to run² when the wound is in process of a sound and careful treatment), in order that we may be in every respect perfect, without any infirmity of sin whatever,—a result which God not only wishes, but even causes and helps us to accomplish. And this God’s grace does, in co-operation with ourselves, through Jesus Christ our Lord, as well by commandments, sacraments, and examples, as by His Holy Spirit also ; through whom there is latently shed abroad in our hearts³ that love, “which maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered,”⁴ until health and salvation be perfected in us, and God be manifested to us as He will be seen in His eternal truth.

CHAP. XXI.—(44.) *Conclusion of the work. In the regenerate it is not concupiscence, but consent, which is sin.*

Whosoever, then, supposes that any man or any men (except the one Mediator between God and man⁵) have ever lived, or are yet living in this present state, who have not wanted, and do not want, forgiveness of sins, he opposes Holy Scripture, wherein it is said by the apostle: “By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.”⁶ And he must needs go on to assert, with an impious contention, that there may possibly be men who are freed and saved from sin without the liberation and salvation of the one Mediator Christ. Whereas He it is who has said: “They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick ;”⁷ “I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.”⁸ He, moreover, who says that any man, after he has received remission of sins, has ever lived in this body, or still is living, so righteously as to have no sin at all, he contradicts the Apostle John, who declares that “If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.”⁹ Observe,

¹ Rom. viii. 29, 30.

⁴ Rom. viii. 26.

⁷ Matt. ix. 12.

² Ps. lxxvii. 2.

⁵ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

⁸ Matt. ix. 13.

³ Rom. v. 5.

⁶ Rom. v. 12.

⁹ 1 John i. 8.

the expression is not *we had*, but "*we have*." If, however, anybody contend that the apostle's statement concerns the sin which dwells in our mortal flesh after the original flaw of our nature, which was caused by the wilfulness of the first man when he sinned, then the Apostle Paul enjoins us "not" to "obey it in the lusts thereof,"¹ [implying] that he does not sin who altogether withholds his consent from this same indwelling sin, and so brings it to no evil work,—either in deed, or word, or thought,—although the lusting after it may be excited (which in another sense has received the name of sin, inasmuch as consenting to it would amount to sinning), but excited against our will. This, no doubt, is drawing subtle distinctions; but the man who indulges in them should consider what relation all this bears to the Lord's Prayer, wherein we say, "Forgive us our debts."² Now, if I judge aright, it would be unnecessary to put up such a prayer as this, if we never in the least degree consented to the lusts of the before-mentioned sin, either in a slip of the tongue, or in a wanton thought; all that it would be needful to say would be, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."³ Nor could the Apostle James say: "In many things we all offend."⁴ For in truth only that man offends whom an evil concupiscence persuades, either by deception or by force, to do or say or think something which he ought to avoid, by directing his appetites or his aversions contrary to the rule of righteousness. Finally, if it be asserted that there either have been, or are in this present life, any persons, with the sole exception of our Great Head, "the Saviour of His body [the Church,]"⁵ who are righteous, without any sin,—and this, either by not consenting to the lusts thereof, or because that must not be accounted as any sin, which is such that God does not impute it to them by reason of their godly lives (although the blessedness of being without sin is a different thing from the blessedness of not having one's sin imputed to him),⁶—I do not deem it necessary to contest the point over much. I am quite aware that some hold this opinion,⁷ whose

¹ Rom. vi. 12.² Matt. vi. 12.³ Matt. vi. 13.⁴ Jas. iii. 2.⁵ Eph. i. 22, 23, and v. 23.⁶ Ps. xxxii. 2.⁷ See Augustine's treatise, *De Natura et Gratia*, 74, 75.

views on the subject I have not the courage to censure, although, at the same time, I cannot defend them. But if any man says that we ought not to use the prayer, "Lead us not into temptation" (and *he* says as much who maintains that God's help is unnecessary to a person for the avoidance of sin, and that his own will, after accepting only the law, is sufficient for the purpose), then I do not hesitate at once to affirm that such a man ought to be removed from the public ear, and to have his anathema pronounced by every mouth.

P R E F A C E

TO THE BOOK

ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF PELAGIUS.

IN the year of Christ 415, Pelagius was accused of heresy in Palestine, and brought to trial on one or two occasions. At the first trial, which was held on or about the 30th of July, at a congress of his presbyters, by John, bishop of Jerusalem, no regular account was kept of the proceedings, as we are informed by Augustine in the following work (sec. 39 and 55). The hour and the day of this assembly we may learn from Orosius, a presbyter of Spain, who was present at the congress, and has in his *Apology* committed to writing some of its most memorable acts. We are informed by him that “after a great deal of earnest proceeding on both sides, the bishop John proposed the last resolution, that certain brethren should be sent with a letter to the blessed Innocent, Pope of Rome, to the intent that he might decide on all the points which were to follow.”

The second trial took place afterwards at a city in Palestine called Diospolis [Lydda], before fourteen bishops, at which was kept an accurate report of the proceedings. The bishops are severally mentioned by Augustine in his work *against Julianus*, chs. v. and vii., in the following order: “Eulogius, John, Ammonianus, Porphyry, Eutonius, another Porphyry, Fidus, Zoninus, Zoboennus, Nymphidius, Chromatius, Jovinus, Eleutherius, and Clematius. There can be no doubt that Eulogius, bishop of Cæsarea, was also primate of the province of Palestine, because he is constantly mentioned by Augustine as

occupying the first place before the other thirteen bishops, and even before John himself, bishop of Jerusalem.

We find from the epistle of Lucian, *De revelatione corporis Stephani martyris*, that this synod was held at the approach of Christmas. In this epistle he tells us of three visions which God had shown him in the year 415,—the first on December 3d, and the other two on the 10th and 17th of the same month; that he then reported the matter to John, bishop of Jerusalem, who sent him in quest of the martyr's sepulchre. He further informs us that he discovered the sepulchre, and at once returned to John, "who (says he) was attending a synod at Lydda, which is Diospolis." This must have happened about the 21st of the month, since Lucian goes on to say that John came, in the company of two more bishops, Eutonius of Sebaste and Eleutherius of Jericho, and that in their presence the relics of the martyr were removed on the 26th day of the same month of December.

A certain deacon, called Annianus, is supposed to have pleaded the cause of Pelagius at the synod; some learned men finding it easier to interpret of this deacon than of Pelagius what Jerome writes in a letter addressed to Alypius and Augustine (*Epist. Augustinian.* 202, 2): "For everything which he denies having ever uttered in that miserable synod of Diospolis he professes to hold in this work." Jerome bestowed the epithet of "miserable" on this synod of Diospolis, for no other reason (as we suppose) than because he discovered from the Acts [or register of the proceedings] how miserably the synod had been duped by Pelagius. Pope Innocent, after a sight of these Acts, expressly owned (see *Epist. Augustinian.* 184, 4) that "he could not bring himself to refuse either blame or praise of those men" [meaning the bishops of the synod]. Augustine, however, in the following treatise (see chs. iv. and viii.), does not hesitate to call them "pious judges," and (in his first book *against Julianus*, ch. v.) "catholic judges," who, when Pelagius abjured the errors attributed to him, pronounced him a Catholic, and acquitted him; indeed, he frequently cites these fourteen bishops as witnesses of the Catholic faith in opposition to Julianus.

In his letters addressed to Pope Innocent in the year 416

(see *Epist. Augustinian.* 175, 4, and 177, 2), Augustine intimated that he knew nothing of the Acts of the synod except from hearsay; and in a letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem (*Epist.* 179, 4), he earnestly requested him to forward them to him. But the report was in his hands about midsummer in 417, when he wrote his Epistle to Paulinus (*Epist.* 186, 31); so that the date of the following treatise is thus traced to the commencement of the year 417, supposing it to have been published immediately after he had received the Acts.

The title given to this work by Augustine, in his book *On Original Sin* (14), stands *De Gestis Palæstinis* [On the Proceedings which took place in Palestine]; by this title Prosper likewise refers to the work (in his book [so-called] *Adv. Collatorem*, 47); but yet we ought to retain the inscription *De Gestis Pelagii*, which is prefixed both to the ancient editions and to the particular *Retractation* in which Augustine reviewed this work. The treatise had this title given to it, no doubt, either because it had been already commonly accepted as a description of these proceedings of Pelagius and his vindication, which led to his boast that he had been acquitted; or else from the fact that an examination had become necessary of those proceedings, which the accused party had himself published in an abridged and garbled form. Hence Possidonius named the treatise by the title, *Contra Gesta Pelagii* [A Protest, or Vindication, against the Proceedings of Pelagius].

Out of this book Photius copied a very accurate account of the Synod of Diospolis and inserted it in his *Bibliotheca* (cod. 54). One may therefore conclude that this work of Augustine's is one of those which Possidonius, in his life [of the saint], ch. xi., mentions as having been "translated into the Greek tongue." The Aurelius to whom the work is dedicated is mentioned by Photius in the cited passage, and by Prosper before him (in the 43d chapter of the above-quoted *Adversus Collatorem*), as "the bishop of Carthage." Now, although the title-page of old did not give them this information, they could both of them discover this fact about Aurelius from reading this book, especially ch. 23 [XI].

EXTRACT FROM THE SECOND BOOK,
CHAPTER XLVII.,
OF
THE RETRACTATIONS.

“[IT happened] about this time, in the East (that is to say, in Syrian Palestine), that Pelagius was summoned by certain Catholic brethren¹ before a tribunal of bishops, and was heard on his trial by fourteen prelates, in the absence of his accusers, who were unable to be present on the day appointed for the synod. On his condemning the very dogmas which were read from the indictment against him, and which assailed the grace of Christ, they pronounced him to be a Catholic. But when the Acts of this synod found their way into our hands, I wrote a treatise on them, to prevent the idea gaining ground that, because he had been in a manner acquitted, his opinions also were approved by the bishops; or that the accused could by any chance have escaped condemnation at their hands, unless he had condemned the opinions charged against him. This treatise of mine begins with these words: ‘After there fell into my hands’—‘*Postea quam in manus nostras.*’”

¹ [Their names were Heros and Lazarus.]

A WORK,
IN ONE BOOK,
ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF PELAGIUS,
ADDRESSED TO
BISHOP AURELIUS [OF CARTHAGE],
BY
AURELIUS AUGUSTINE.

WRITTEN ABOUT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE YEAR A.D. 417.

THE SEVERAL HEADS OF ERROR WHICH WERE ALLEGED AGAINST PELAGIUS AT THE SYNOD IN PALESTINE, WITH HIS ANSWERS TO EACH CHARGE, ARE MINUTELY DISCUSSED. AUGUSTINE SHOWS THAT, ALTHOUGH PELAGIUS WAS ACQUITTED BY THE SYNOD, THERE STILL CLAVE TO HIM A SUSPICION OF HERESY; AND THAT THE ACQUITTAL OF THE ACCUSED BY THE SYNOD WAS SO CONTRIVED, THAT THE HERESY ITSELF WITH WHICH HE WAS CHARGED WAS UNHESITATINGLY CONDEMNED.

CHAP. I. INTRODUCTION.

AFTER there fell into my hands, holy father Aurelius, the ecclesiastical acts, by which fourteen bishops of the province of Palestine pronounced Pelagius a Catholic, that hesitation of mine received its limit, which previously rendered me reluctant to make any lengthy or confident statement about his actual defence. This defence, indeed, I had already read in a paper, which he himself forwarded to me. Forasmuch, however, as I received no letter therewith from him, I was afraid that some discrepancy might be detected between my own statement of the subject and the record itself of the ecclesiastical proceedings; and that, should Pelagius say, as was quite possible, that he had not sent me any paper (and it would have been difficult for me to prove that he had when

there was only one witness in the case), I should myself rather seem guilty in the eyes of all, who would readily credit his denial either of a supposed falsification, or else (to say the least) of a reckless credulity. Now, however, when I am to treat of matters which are shown to have actually transpired, and when, as it appears to me, all doubt is removed whether he really acted in the way described, your holiness, and everybody who reads these pages, will no doubt be able to judge, with greater readiness and certainty, both of his defence and of this my treatment of it.

CHAP. 2. [I.]

First of all, then, I offer to the Lord my God, who is also my defence and guide, unspeakable thanks, because I was not misled in my views respecting our holy brethren and fellow-bishops who sat as judges on that case. His answers, indeed, they approved, and not without reason; because they had not to consider how he had in his writings stated the points which were objected against him, but what he had to say about them in his reply at the pending inquiry. A case of unsoundness in the faith is one thing, that of incautious statement is another thing. Now sundry objections were urged against Pelagius out of a certain book, which our holy brethren and fellow-bishops in Gaul, Heros and Lazarus, gave [to Bishop Eulogius,]¹ being themselves unable to be present, owing (as we afterwards learned from credible information) to the severe indisposition of one of them. The first of these objectionable opinions, which he inserts in a certain book of his, is this: "No man can be without sin unless he has acquired a knowledge of the law." After this had been read out, the synod inquired: "Did you, Pelagius, express yourself thus?" Then in answer he said: "I certainly used the words, but not in the sense in which they understand them. I did not say that a man is unable to sin who has acquired a knowledge of the law; but that a man is by the knowledge of the law assisted towards not sinning, even as it is written, 'He hath given them a law for a help.'"² Upon hearing

¹ [Who presided in this synod during the trial of Pelagius. His name is mentioned below, see ch. 3. [ix.]

² Isa. viii. 20 (Septuagint).

this, the synod declared: "The words which have been spoken by Pelagius are not alien from the mind of the Church." Assuredly they are not alien, as he expressed them in his answer; the statement, however, which was produced from his book has a different sound. But this the bishops, who were Greek-speaking men, and did not catch the words through the interpreter, did not care about discussing. All they had to consider at the moment was, what the man who was under examination said was his meaning,—not in what words his opinion was alleged to have been expressed in his book.

CHAP. 3.

Now to say that a man is by a knowledge of the law assisted towards not sinning, is a different assertion from saying that a man cannot be without sin unless he has acquired a knowledge of the law. We see, for example, that corn-floors may be threshed without machines,—however much these may assist the operation; and that boys can find their way to school without the pedagogue,—however valuable for the conduct be the office of pedagogues; and that many persons recover from sickness without physicians,—although the doctor's skill is clearly of greatest use; and that men sometimes thrive on other aliments besides bread,—however invaluable the use of bread must needs be allowed to be; and several other illustrations may occur to the thoughtful reader, without our prompting. From which instances we are undoubtedly reminded that there are two sorts of aids. Some are indispensable, and without their help results could not be attained. Without a ship, for instance, no man could take a voyage; no man could speak without a voice; without legs no man could walk; without light nobody could see; and so on in numberless instances. Amongst them this also may be reckoned, that without God's grace no man can live rightly. But then, again, there are other helps, which render us assistance in such a way that we might effect the object to which they are ordinarily auxiliary even in their absence. Such are those which I have already mentioned,—the machines for threshing corn, the pedagogue for conducting the child, medical art applied to the recovery of health, and other like instances. We have therefore to inquire to which of these two classes

belongs the knowledge of the law,—in other words, to consider in what way it helps us towards the avoidance of sin. If it be in the sense of an indispensable aid, not only was Pelagius' answer before the judges true, but what he wrote in his book was true also. If, however, the help afforded by the knowledge of the law be of such a character, that the avoiding of sin can only be effected by it when it is present, but even if it be absent, then the result is still obtainable by some other means,—in this case, indeed, his answer to the judges was still true, and not unreasonably did it find favour with the bishops, to the effect that “man is assisted in not sinning by a knowledge of the law;” but what he wrote in his book is not true, that “there is no man without sin except him who has acquired a knowledge of the law,”—a statement which the judges left [undetermined and even] undiscussed. They were ignorant of the Latin language, and were content with the confession of the man who was pleading his cause before them; especially as no one was present on the other side who could oblige the interpreter to expose his meaning by an explanation of the words of his book, and to show why it was that the brethren were not groundlessly moved [to bring their charges against the accused.] For but very few persons are thoroughly acquainted with the law. The mass of the members of Christ, who are scattered abroad everywhere, being ignorant of the very profound and complicated contents of the law, have their merit in that piety and unflinching hope in God and sincerity of love which spring from their simple faith. Endowed with such gifts, they trust that by the grace of God they may be purged from their sins through our Lord Jesus Christ.

CHAP. 4. [II.]

If Pelagius, as he probably might, were to say in reply to this, that this very description [of the Christian graces] was what he meant by “the knowledge of the law,” which is indispensable for a man's being free from sins, which is also communicated by the doctrine of faith to converts and babes in Christ, and in which candidates for baptism are catechetically instructed with a view to their knowing the creed, [all I can say is, that] this is not what is usually meant when any one is said to have a knowledge of the law. This phrase is

only applied to such persons as are skilled in the law. But if he persists in describing the knowledge of the law by the words in question, which, however few in number, are massive in weight, and used to designate all who are rightly baptized according to the prescribed rule of the Churches; and if he maintains that it was of this that he said, "No one is without sin, but the man who has acquired the knowledge of the law,"—a knowledge which must needs be conveyed to believers before they attain to the actual remission of sins,—even in such case there would crowd around him a countless multitude, not indeed of angry disputants, but of whining baptized infants, who would exclaim,—not, to be sure, in words, but in the very truthfulness of innocence,—“What is it, O what is it that you have written: ‘He only can be without sin who has acquired a knowledge of the law?’ See here are we, a large flock of lambs; we are without sin, and yet we have no knowledge of the law.” Now surely they with their silent tongue would compel him to silence, or, perhaps, even to confess that he was corrected of his great perverseness; or else (if you will), that he had already for some time entertained the opinion which he acknowledged before his ecclesiastical examiners, but that he had failed before to express his opinion in words of sufficient care,—that his faith, therefore, should be approved, but his book revised and amended. For as the Scripture says: “There is that slippeth in his speech, but not from his heart.”¹ Now if he would only admit this, or were already saying as much, who would not most readily forgive those words which he had committed to writing with too great heedlessness and neglect, especially on his declining to defend the opinion which the said words contain, and affirming that to be his proper view which the truth approves? This we must suppose was in the minds of the pious judges themselves; but yet, if they could only have understood the contents of his Latin book, duly interpreted to them, as [they understood] his reply to the synod which was spoken in Greek, and therefore quite intelligible to them, they would have adjudged the former, as they did in fact the latter, as not alien from the Church. Let us go on to consider the other cases.

¹ Ecclus. xix. 16.

CHAP. 5. [III.]

The synod of bishops then proceeded to say: "Let another section be read." Accordingly there was read the passage in the same book wherein Pelagius had laid down the position that "all men are ruled by their own will." On this being read, Pelagius said in answer: "This I stated in the interest of the freedom of our will. God is its helper whenever it chooses good; man, however, when sinning is himself in fault, as under the direction of a free will." Upon hearing this, the bishops exclaimed: "Nor again is this opposed to the doctrine of the Church." For who indeed could condemn or deny the freedom of the will, when God's help is associated with it? His opinion, therefore, as thus explained in his answer, was, and not without good reason, deemed satisfactory by the bishops. And yet, after all, the statement made in his book, "All men are ruled by their own will," ought no doubt to have moved the apprehensions of our brethren, who had discovered how much his party advanced in discussion against the grace of God. The bare statement, "All men are ruled by their own will," implies that God rules no man, and that the Scripture says in vain, "Save Thy people, [O Lord,] and bless Thine inheritance; rule them, and lift them up for ever."¹ They would not, of course, remain in one stay, if they are ruled only by their own will without God, even as sheep which have no shepherd. Now unquestionably to be led is something more compulsory than to be ruled. He who is ruled at the same time does something himself,—indeed, when ruled by God, it is with the express view that he should also act rightly; whereas the man who is led can hardly be understood to do anything himself at all. And yet the Saviour's helpful grace is so much better than our own wills and desires, that the apostle does not hesitate to say: "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God."² And our free will can do nothing better for us than to submit itself to be led by Him who can do nothing amiss; and after doing this, not to doubt that it was helped to do it by Him of whom it is said in the psalm, "He is my God, His mercy shall go before me."³

¹ Ps. xxviii. 9.² Rom. viii. 14.³ Ps. lix. 10.

CHAP. 6.

Indeed, in this very book which contains these statements, after laying down the position, "All men are governed by their own will, and every one submits himself to his own desire," Pelagius goes on to adduce the testimony of Scripture, from which it is evident enough that no man ought to trust to himself for direction. For on this very subject the Wisdom of Solomon declares: "I myself also am a mortal man like unto all; and the offspring of him that was first made of the earth,"¹—with other similar words to the conclusion of the paragraph, where we read: "For all men have one entrance into life, and the like going out therefrom; wherefore I prayed, and understanding was given to me; I called [upon God,] and the Spirit of Wisdom came into me."² Now is it not clearer than light itself, how that man, on duly considering the wretchedness of human frailty, did not dare to commit himself to his own direction, but prayed, and understanding was given to him, concerning which the apostle says: "But we have the mind [or understanding] of the Lord;"³ and he called [upon God,] and the Spirit of Wisdom entered into him? Now it is by this Spirit, and not by the strength of their own will, that they who are God's children are governed and led.

CHAP. 7.

As for the passage from the psalm, "He loved cursing, and it shall come upon him; and he willed not blessing, so it shall be far removed from him,"⁴ which he quoted as if to prove his own point, "that all men are ruled by their own will," who can be ignorant that this is not a fault of nature as God created it, but of that human will which departed away from God? The fact indeed is, that even if he had not loved cursing, and had willed blessing, he would in this very case, too, deny that his will had received any assistance from God; in his ingratitude and impiety, moreover, he would submit himself to be ruled by himself, until he found out to his cost, by the penalties of his condition, that, sunk as he was into ruin without God to govern him, he was utterly incapable of directing his own self. In like manner, from the passage which he quoted in the same book under the same head of his subject, "He hath set fire and

¹ Wisd. vii. 1.² Wisd. vii. 6, 7.³ 1 Cor. ii. 16.⁴ Ps. cix. 18.

water before thee; stretch forth thy hand unto whether thou wilt; before man are good and evil, life and death, and whichever he liketh shall be given to him,"¹ it is manifest that, if he applies his hand to fire, and if evil and death please him, his human will effects all this; but if, on the contrary, he loves goodness and life, not alone does his will accomplish the happy choice, but as it is assisted by divine grace. For purposes of darkness or not seeing, the eye indeed is self-sufficient; but for the purposes of sight, it is in its own luminous resources not self-sufficient; the assistance of a clear external light must be rendered to it. God forbid, however, that they who are "the called according to His purpose, whom He also foreknew, and predestinated to be conformed to the likeness of His Son,"² should be given up to perish through their own wilful desire. This end is suffered only by "the vessels of wrath,"³ who are perfectly prepared for perdition; in whose very destruction, indeed, God "makes known the riches of His glory on the vessels of His mercy."⁴ Now it is on this account that, after saying, "He is my God, His mercy shall go before me,"⁵ he immediately adds, "My God will show me vengeance upon my enemies."⁶ That therefore happens to them which is mentioned in Scripture, "God gave them up to the lusts of their own heart."⁷ This, however, does not happen to the predestinated, who are ruled by the Spirit of God, for not in vain is their cry: "Deliver me not, O Lord, to the sinner, according to my desire."⁸ With regard, indeed, to the evil lusts which assail them, their prayer has ever assumed some such shape as this: "Take away from me the concupiscence of the belly; and let not the desire of lust take hold of me."⁹ Upon those whom He governs as His subjects does God bestow this gift; but not upon those who think themselves capable of governing themselves, and who, in the stiff-necked confidence of their own self-will, disdain to have Him to rule over them.

CHAP. 8.

This being the case, how must God's children, who have learned the truth of all this, and rejoice at being ruled and led by the

¹ Ecclus. xv. 16, 17.² Rom. viii. 29.³ Rom. ix. 22.⁴ Rom. ix. 23.⁵ Ps. lix. 10.⁶ Same verse.⁷ Rom. i. 24.⁸ Ps. cxl. 8 (Sept.).⁹ Ecclus. xxiii. 5, 6.

Spirit of God, have been affected when they heard or read that Pelagius had declared in writing that "all men are governed by their own will, and that every one submits himself to his own desire?" And yet, when questioned by the bishops, he fully perceived what an evil impression these words of his might produce; so he told them in his answer that "he had made such an assertion in the interests of free will,"—adding at once, "God is the helper of this free will whenever it chooses good; whilst man is himself in fault when he sins, as being under the influence of his own will." Although the pious judges even approved of this sentiment, they were unwilling to consider or examine how incautiously he had written, or indeed in what sense he had employed the words found in his book. They thought it was enough that he had made such a confession concerning the freedom of the will, as to admit that God helped the man who chose the good; whereas the man who sinned was himself to blame, his own inclination having all to do with his conduct in this direction. According to this, God rules those whom He assists in their choice of the good. So far, then, as they rule anything themselves, they rule it rightly, since they themselves are ruled by Him who is right and good.

CHAP. 9.

Another statement was read which Pelagius had placed in his book, to this effect: "In the day of judgment no leniency will be shown to the ungodly and the sinner; but they will be consumed in eternal fires." This induced the brethren to regard the statement as open to the objection, that it seemed so worded as to imply that all sinners whatever ought to be punished with an eternal penalty, without excepting even those who hold Christ as their foundation, although "they build thereupon wood, hay, stubble,"¹ concerning whom the apostle writes: "If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he shall himself be saved, yet so as by fire."² When, however, Pelagius said in his self-defence that "he had made his assertion in accordance with the Gospel, in which it is written concerning sinners, 'They shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal,'"³ it was impossible for Christian judges to

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 12.² 1 Cor. iii. 15.³ Matt. xxv. 46.

be dissatisfied with a sentence which is written in the Gospel, and was spoken by the Lord; especially as they knew not what there was in the words of Pelagius' book which could so disturb the brethren, who were accustomed to hear his discussions, and those of his followers. Since also they were absent¹ who presented the indictment against Pelagius to the holy bishop Eulogius, there was no one to urge him that he ought to distinguish by allowing some exceptional case between those sinners who must be saved by fire, and those who must be punished with everlasting perdition. If, indeed, the judges had come to understand by these means the reason why the objection had been made to his statement, had he then refused to allow the distinction, he would have been justly open to blame.

CHAP. 10. *On Origen's error concerning the non-eternity of the punishment of the devil and the damned.*

What Pelagius said in addition to his last statement, "Who believes differently is an Origenist," was approved by the judges, because in very deed the Church most justly abominates the opinion of Origen, that even they whom the Lord pronounces worthy of everlasting punishment, and the devil himself and his angels, will be purged, and after a time, however protracted, be released from their punishment, and shall then cleave to the saints who reign with God in the society of their blessed life. This additional sentence, therefore, the synod pronounced to be "not opposed to the Church,"—accepting it not in Pelagius' sense, but rather in accordance with the Gospel, that the ungodly and sinful men whom eternal fires shall consume will be such as the Gospel determines to be worthy of such a punishment; and that he is a sharer in Origen's abominable opinion, who affirms that their punishment can possibly ever come to an end, when the Lord has said it is to be eternal. Concerning those sinners, however, of whom the apostle declares that "they shall be saved, yet so as by fire, after their [evil] work has been burnt up,"² inasmuch as no objectionable opinion in reference to them was manifestly chargeable against Pelagius, the synod determined nothing. Wherefore he who says that the ungodly and sinner, whom the truth consigns to eternal punishment, can ever be

¹ The bishops Heros and Lazarus; see above 1 [II.].

² 1 Cor. iii. 12, 15.

liberated therefrom, is not unfitly designated by Pelagius as an "*Origenist*." But, on the other hand, he who supposes that no sinner whatever deserves mercy in the judgment of God, may be designated by whatever name Pelagius is disposed to give to him, only it must at the same time be quite understood that the supposition is an error, and is not received as truth by the Church. "For he shall have judgment without mercy that hath showed no mercy."¹

CHAP. 11.

But how this judgment is to be accomplished, it is not easy to understand from Holy Scripture; for there are many modes therein of describing that which is to come to pass only in one mode. In one place the Lord declares that He will "shut the door" against those whom He does not admit into His kingdom; and that, on their clamorously demanding admission, "Open unto us, . . . we have eaten and drunk in Thy presence," and so forth, as the Scripture describes this expostulation, "He will say unto them in answer, I know you not, . . . all ye workers of iniquity."² In another passage He reminds us that He will command "all which would not that He should reign over them to be brought to Him, and be slain in His presence."³ In another place, again, He tells us that He will come with His angels in His majesty; and before Him shall be gathered all nations, and He shall separate them one from another; some He will set on His right hand, and after enumerating their good works, will award to them eternal life; and others on His left hand, whose barrenness in all good works He will expose, will He condemn to everlasting burnings.⁴ In two other passages He deals,—[in one] with that wicked and slothful servant, who neglected to trade with His money,⁵ and [in the other] with the man who was found at the feast without the wedding garment,—and He orders them to be bound hand and foot, and to be cast into outer darkness.⁶ And in yet another scripture, after admitting the five virgins who were wise, He shuts the door against the other five foolish ones.⁷ Now these descriptions,—and there are others which at the instant do not

¹ Jas. ii. 13.² Luke xiii. 25-27.³ Luke xix. 27.⁴ Matt. xxv. 33.⁵ Luke xix. 20-24.⁶ Matt. xxii. 11-13.⁷ Matt. xxv. 1-10.

occur to me,—are all intended to represent to us the future judgment, which of course will be held not over one, or over five, but over multitudes. For if it were a solitary case only of the man who was cast into outer darkness for not having on the wedding garment, He would not have gone on at once to give it a plural turn, by saying: “For many are called, but few are chosen;”¹ whereas it is plain that, after the one was cast out and condemned, many still remained behind in the house. However, it would occupy us too long to discuss all these questions to the full. This brief remark, however, I may make, without prejudice (as they say in affairs of money) to some better discussion, that by the many descriptions which are scattered throughout the Holy Scriptures there is signified to us but one mode and process of final judgment, which is inscrutable to our minds,—all that admits of any variety being the rewards and punishments which will follow men’s deserts. Touching the particular point, indeed, which we have before us at present, it is sufficient to remark that, if Pelagius had actually said that all sinners whatever without exception would be punished in an eternity of punishment by everlasting fire, then whosoever of his judges² had approved of this, he would, to begin with, have brought the sentence [of the synod] down on his own head. “For who will boast that he [has a pure heart, or will boldly say that he] is pure from sins?”³ Forasmuch, however, as he did not say *all*, nor *certain*, but made an indefinite statement only,—and afterwards, in explanation, declared that his meaning was according to the words of the Gospel,—his opinion was affirmed by the judgment of the bishops to be true; but it does not even now appear what Pelagius really thinks on the subject, and in consequence there is no indecency in inquiring further into the decision of the episcopal judges.

CHAP. 12. [IV.]

It was further objected against Pelagius, that he had written in his book, that “evil did not enter his thoughts.”

¹ Matt. xxii. 14.

² [Judicium; the other reading, *judicium*, means, “If any one had approved of such a judgment,” etc.]

³ Prov. xx. 9 (Septuagint).

In reply, however, to this charge, he said: "We made no such statement. What we did say was, that the Christian ought to be careful not to have evil thoughts." Of this, as it became them, the bishops approved. For who can doubt that evil ought not to be thought of? And, indeed, if what he said in his book about evil not being thought runs in this form, "*nec cogitandum quidem*," the ordinary meaning of such words is "that evil ought not even to be thought of." Now if any person denies this, what else does he in fact say, than that evil ought to be thought of? And if this were true, it could not be said in praise of charity that "it thinketh no evil!"¹ But after all, the phrase about "*not entering into the thoughts*" of righteous and holy men is not quite a commendable one, for this reason, that what enters the mind is commonly called a thought, even when assent to it does not follow. The thought, however, which involves blame, and is justly forbidden, is never unaccompanied with assent and compliance. Possibly those men had an incorrect copy of Pelagius' writings, who thought it proper to object to him that he had used the words: "*Malum nec in cogitationem venire*," that is, that whatever is evil never entered into the thoughts of righteous and holy men. Which is, of course, a very absurd statement. For whenever we censure evil things, we cannot enunciate them in words, unless they have first occupied the thoughts. But, as we said before, that is termed a culpable thought of evil which carries with it the assent of our will.

CHAP. 13. [v.]

After the judges had accorded their approbation to this answer of Pelagius, another passage which he had written in his book was read aloud: "The kingdom of heaven was promised even in the Old Testament." Upon this Pelagius remarked in vindication: "This can be readily proved by the Scriptures. The heretics, however, in order to disparage the Old Testament, deny this statement; but I simply followed the authority of the Scriptures when I said this; for in the prophet Daniel it is written: 'The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.'"² After they had heard this answer, the synod said: "This is not opposed at all to the Church's faith."

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 5.² Dan. vii. 18.

CHAP. 14. *The phrase "Old Testament" used in two senses. The heir of the Old Testament. In the Old Testament there were heirs of the New Testament.*

Was it therefore without reason that our brethren [the accusing bishops] were moved by his words to include this charge among the others against him? Certainly not. The fact is, that the phrase *Old Testament* is constantly employed in two different ways,—in one, following the authority of the Holy Scriptures; in the other, following the most common mode of speech. For the Apostle Paul says, in his Epistle to the Galatians: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a free woman. . . . Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants [or *testaments*]; the one which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and is most intimately connected with the Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children; whereas the Jerusalem which is above is free, and is the mother of us all."¹ Now, inasmuch as the Old Testament tends to bondage, whence it is written, "Cast out the bond-woman and her son, for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with my son Isaac,"² whereas the kingdom of heaven tends to liberty; what has the kingdom of heaven to do with the Old Covenant [or *Testament*]? Since, however, as I have already remarked, we are accustomed, in our ordinary use of words, to designate all those Scriptures of the law and the prophets which were given previous to the Lord's incarnation, and are embraced together by canonical authority, under the name and title of *the Old Testament*, what man who is ever so moderately informed in ecclesiastical lore can be ignorant that the kingdom of heaven could be quite as well promised in those early Scriptures as even the New Testament itself, to which the kingdom of heaven belongs? At all events, in those ancient Scriptures it is most distinctly written: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will accomplish a new covenant [or *testament*] with the house of Israel and with the house of Jacob; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the

¹ Gal. iv. 21-26.

² Gal. iv. 30.

hand, to lead them out of the land of Egypt.”¹ This was done on Mount Sinai. But then there had not yet risen the prophet Daniel to say: “The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom.”² For by these words he foretold the merit not of the Old, but of the New Testament. In the same manner did the same prophets [of the Old Testament] foretell that Christ Himself would come, in whose blood the New Covenant [or Testament] was consecrated. Of this Testament also the apostles became the ministers, as the most blessed Paul declares: “He hath made us able ministers of the New Testament; not in its letter, but its spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life.”³ In that testament, however, which is properly called the Old, and was given on Mount Sinai, only earthly happiness is expressly promised. Accordingly that land, into which the nation, after being led through the wilderness, was conducted, is called the land of promise, wherein peace and royal power, and the gaining of victories over enemies, and an abundance of children and of fruits of the ground, and gifts of a similar kind, are the promises of the Old Testament. And these, indeed, are figures of the spiritual blessings which appertain to the New Testament; but yet the man who lives under God’s law with those earthly blessings for his sanction, is precisely the heir of the Old Testament [or Covenant,] for just such rewards are promised and given to him, according to the terms of the Old Covenant, as are the objects of his desire according to the condition of the old man. But whatever blessings are there figuratively set forth as appertaining to the New Testament require the new man to give them effect. And no doubt the great apostle understood perfectly well what he was saying, when he described the two covenants [or testaments] as capable of the allegorical distinction of the bond-woman and the free,—attributing the children of the flesh to the Old Covenant, and to the New the children of the promise: “They,” says he, “which are the children of the flesh, are not the children of God; but the children of the promise are counted for the seed.”⁴ The children of the flesh, then, belong to the earthly Jerusalem, which is in bondage with

¹ Jer. xxxi. 31, 32.² Dan. vii. 18.³ 2 Cor. iii. 6.⁴ Rom. ix. 8.

her children ; whereas the children of the promise belong to the Jerusalem above, the free, the mother of us all, eternal in the heavens.¹ Whence we can easily see who they are that appertain to the earthly, and who to the heavenly kingdom. But then the happy persons, who even in that early age were by the grace of God taught to understand the distinction now set forth, were thereby made the children of promise, and were accounted in the secret purpose of God as heirs of the New Covenant [which was to come] ; although they continued with perfect fitness to administer the Old Testament to the ancient people of God, because that covenant was divinely appropriated to that people in God's distribution of the times and seasons.

CHAP. 15.

How then should there not be a feeling of just disquietude entertained by the children of promise, sons of the free Jerusalem, which is eternal in the heavens, when they see that by the words of Pelagius the distinction which has been drawn by Apostolic and Catholic authority is abolished, and Agar is supposed to be by some means on a par with Sarah? He therefore does injury to the scripture of the Old Testament with the depravity of a heretic, who with an impious and sacrilegious face denies that it was inspired by the good, supreme, and very God, —as Marcion does, as Manichæus does, and other pests of similar opinions. On this account (that I may put into as brief a space as I can what my own views are on the subject), as much injury is done to the New Testament, when it is put on the same level with the Old Testament, as is inflicted on the Old itself, when men deny it to be the work of the supreme God of goodness. Now, when Pelagius in his answer gave as his reason (for saying that even in the Old Testament there was a promise of the kingdom of heaven), the testimony of the prophet Daniel, who most plainly foretold that the saints should receive the kingdom of the Most High, it was fairly decided that the statement of Pelagius was not opposed to the Catholic faith, although not according to the distinction which shows that the earthly promises of Mount Sinai are the proper characteristics of the Old Testament ; nor indeed was the

¹ Gal. iv. 25, 26.

decision an improper one, considering that mode of speech which designates all the canonical Scriptures which were given to men before the Lord's coming in the flesh by the title of the "Old Testament." The kingdom of the Most High is of course none other than the kingdom of God; otherwise, anybody might boldly contend that the kingdom of God is one thing, and the kingdom of heaven another.

CHAP. 16. [VI.]

The next objection was to the effect that Pelagius in that same book of his wrote thus: "A man is able, if he likes, to live without sin;" and that he addressed a certain widow in a letter in the following fulsome strain: "In thee piety may find a dwelling-place, such as she finds nowhere else; in thee righteousness, though a stranger in every other place, can find a sojourn; that truth, which no one any longer recognises, can discover an abode and a friend in thee; by thee alone, moreover, that law of God, which almost everybody despises, is honoured." And in another sentence he writes: "O how happy and blessed art thou, when that righteousness which we must believe to flourish only in heaven has found a shelter on earth only in thy heart!" In another work addressed to her, after reciting the prayer of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and teaching her in what manner saints ought to pray, he says: "Such an one is worthy to raise his hands to God; and with a good conscience does he pour out his prayer, since he is able to say, 'Thou, O Lord, knowest how holy and harmless are the hands which I stretch out to Thee; how pure also they are of all injury, and iniquity, and violence; moreover, how righteous, and pure, and free from all deceit, are the lips with which I offer to Thee my supplication, that Thou wouldst have mercy upon me.'" To all this Pelagius said in answer: "We asserted that a man could, if he liked, live without sin, and could keep God's commandments; but that this power was given to him by God. But we never said that any man could be found who at no time whatever, from infancy to old age, committed sin; but that if any person were converted from his sins, he could by his own labour and God's grace live without sin. And yet nobody even thus was rendered incapable of change ever afterwards. As for the

other statements which they have made against us, they are not to be found in our books, nor have we at any time said such things." Upon hearing this vindication, the synod put this question to him: "You have denied having ever written such words; are you therefore ready to anathematize those who do hold these opinions?" Pelagius answered: "I anathematize them as fools, but not as heretics, for there is no dogma in the business." The bishops then pronounced their judgment in these words: "Since now Pelagius has with his own mouth anathematized this vague statement as foolish verbiage, declaring in his reply, 'That a man is able with God's assistance and grace to live without sin,' let him now proceed to answer the other heads of accusation against him."

CHAP. 17.

Well now, had the judges in this case either the power or the right to condemn these unrecognised and vague words, when no person on the other side was present to prove that Pelagius had written the very culpable sentences which were alleged to have been addressed by him to the widow? In such a matter, it surely could not be enough to produce a manuscript, and to read out of it words as his, if there were not also witnesses forthcoming [to identify the writing] in case he denied, on the words being read out, that they ever dropped from his pen. But even here the judges did all that lay in their power to do, when they asked Pelagius whether he would anathematize the persons who held such sentiments as he declared he had never himself propounded either in speech or in writing. And when he answered that he did anathematize them as fools, what right had the judges to push the inquiry any further on the matter, in the absence of Pelagius' opponents?

CHAP. 18.

But perhaps the point requires some consideration, whether he was right in saying that "such as held the opinions in question deserved anathema, not as heretics, but as fools, since there was no dogma in the matter." The question, when fairly confronted, is no doubt far from being an unimportant one,—how far a man deserves to be described as a heretic? On this occasion, however, the judges acted rightly

in abstaining from it altogether. Let us take an instance to illustrate the point. If any one were to allege that eaglets are suspended on the talons of the parent bird, and so exposed to the rays of the sun, such as wink or finch are flung to the ground as spurious, the light being in some mysterious way the gauge of their genuine nature, he is not to be accounted a heretic, although the story happens to be untrue.¹ Now, since it occurs in the writings of the learned, and is very commonly received as fact, ought it to be considered a foolish thing to mention it, even though it be not true? much less ought our credit, which gains for us the name of being trustworthy, to be affected, on the one hand injuriously if the story be believed by us, or beneficially if disbelieved.² If, to go a step further in illustration, any one were from this instance to contend that there existed in birds reasonable souls, from the notion that human souls at intervals passed into them, then indeed we should have to reject from our mind and ears alike an idea like this as the rankest heresy; and even if the story about the eagles were true (as there are many curious facts about bees confest to the most common observation), we should still have to consider, and even demonstrate, the great difference that exists between the condition of creatures like these, which are quite irrational, however surprising in their powers of sensation, and the nature which is common (not to human beings and brute animals, but) to men and angels. There are, to be sure, a great many foolish things said by foolish and ignorant persons, which yet fail to prove them heretics. One might instance the silly talk so commonly heard about the pursuits of other people, from persons who have never learned these pursuits; equally hasty and untenable are the judgments they express, whether in the shape of excessive and indiscriminate praise of those they love, or of blame in the case of those they happen to dislike. The same remark might be made concerning the usual current of human conversation: whenever it does not touch on a subject which requires dogmatic accuracy of statement, but is thrown out at

¹ [It is told by Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* x. 3 (3), and Lucan, *Pharsalia*, ix. 902, etc.]

² [*Creditum*, however, is read in both clauses; we should expect *non creditum* in one, as one reading has it.]

random, or suggested by the passing moment, it is too often pervaded by foolish levity, whether uttered by the mouth or expressed in writing. Many persons, indeed, when gently reminded of their reckless gossip, have afterwards much regretted their conduct; [its only excuse was its utter thoughtlessness, for] they scarcely recollected what they had never uttered with a fixed purpose, but had poured forth in a sheer volley of casual and unconsidered words. It is, unhappily, almost impossible to be quite clear of such faults. Who is he "that slippeth not in his tongue,"¹ and "offendeth not in word?"² It, however, makes all the difference in the world, to what extent, and from what motive, and whether in fact at all, a man when warned of his fault corrects it, or obstinately clings to it so as to make a dogma and settled opinion of that which he had not at first uttered on purpose, but only in levity. Although, then, it turns out eventually that every heretic is a fool, it does not follow that every fool must on the nonce be dubbed a heretic. The judges were quite right in saying that Pelagius had anathematized the vague folly under consideration by its fitting designation; for even if it were heresy, there could be no doubt of its being foolish prattle. Whatever, therefore, it was, they designated the offence under a general name. But whether the quoted words had been used with any definitely dogmatic purpose, or only in a vague and indeterminate sense, and with an unmeaningness which should be capable of an easy correction, they did not deem it necessary to discuss on the present occasion, since the man who was on his trial before them denied that the words were his at all, in whatever sense they had been employed.

CHAP. 19.

Now it so happened that, while we were reading this defence of Pelagius in the small paper which we received at first,³ there were present certain holy brethren, who said that they had in their possession some hortatory or consolatory works which Pelagius had addressed to a widow lady whose name did not appear, and they advised us to examine whether the words which he had abjured for his own occurred

¹ See *Eccles.* xix. 16.

² See *Jas.* iii. 2.

³ See below, in chap. 57. [xxxii.]

anywhere in these books. They were not themselves aware whether they did or not. The said books were accordingly read through, and the words in question were actually discovered in them. Moreover, they who had produced the copy of the book, affirmed that four years had almost passed away since they first regarded the contents as really the work of Pelagius, nor had they once heard a doubt expressed about his authorship. Considering, then, from the integrity of these servants of God, which was very well known to us, how impossible it was for them to use deceit in the matter, the conclusion seemed inevitable, that Pelagius must be supposed by us to have rather been the deceiver at his trial before the bishops; only we thought it was quite possible that something might, even all those years before, have been put out in his name, although not actually composed by him, for not even did our informants tell us that they had received the books from Pelagius himself, nor had they ever heard him admit his own authorship. Now, in my own case, certain of our brethren have told me that sundry writings have found their way into Spain under my name. Such persons, indeed, as had read my genuine writings could not recognise those others as mine; although by other persons my authorship of them was quite believed.

CHAP. 20. [VII.]—*Pelagius acknowledges the doctrine of grace in deceptive terms.*

There can be no doubt that what Pelagius has acknowledged as his own views is as yet a very obscure affair. I suppose, however, that it will become apparent in the subsequent details of these synodal proceedings. Now he says: "We have affirmed that a man is able, if he likes, to live without sin, and to keep the commandments of God, inasmuch as God gives him this ability. But we have not said that any man can be found, who from infancy to old age has never committed sin; but that if any person were converted from his sins, he could by his own exertion and God's grace live without sin. Nobody, however, even thus was ever rendered incapable of change afterwards." Now it is quite uncertain what he means in these words by the grace of God; and the judges, Catholic as they were, could not possibly understand

by the phrase anything else than the grace which is so very strongly recommended to us in the apostle's teaching. Now this is the grace whereby we hope that we can be delivered from the body of this death through our Lord Jesus Christ,¹ and for the obtaining of which we pray that we may not be led into temptation.² This grace is not nature, but it renders assistance to frail and impaired nature. This grace is not the knowledge of the law, but is that of which the apostle says: "I will not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."³ Therefore it is not "the letter that killeth, but the life-giving spirit."⁴ For the knowledge of the law, without the grace of the Spirit, produces all kinds of concupiscence in man; for, as the apostle says, "I had not known sin but by the law: I had not known lust, unless the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence."⁵ By saying this, however, he blames not the law; he rather praises it, for he says afterwards: "The law indeed is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good."⁶ And he goes on to ask: "Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, wrought death in me by that which is good."⁷ And, again, he praises the law by saying: "We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I know not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good."⁸ Observe, then, he knows the law, praises it, and consents to it; for what it commands, that he also wishes; and what it forbids, and condemns, that he also hates: but for all that, what he hates, that he actually does. There is in his mind, therefore, a knowledge of the holy law of God, but still his evil concupiscence is not cured. He has a good will within him, but still what he does is evil. Hence it comes to pass that, amidst the mutual struggles of the two laws within him,—“the law in his members warring against the law of

¹ Rom. vii. 24, 25.² Matt. vi. 13.³ Gal. ii. 21.⁴ 2 Cor. iii. 6.⁵ Rom. vii. 7, 8.⁶ Rom. vii. 12.⁷ Rom. vii. 13.⁸ Rom. vii. 14-16.

his mind, and making him captive to the law of sin,"¹—he confesses his misery, and exclaims in such words as these: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death? I thank God; through Jesus Christ our Lord."²

CHAP. 21. [VIII.]

It is not nature, you may be well assured, which, sold as it is under sin and wounded by the ruin, longs for a Redeemer and Saviour; nor is it the knowledge of the law—through which comes the discovery, not the expulsion, of sin—which delivers us from the body of this death; but it is the Lord's good grace through our Lord Jesus Christ.³

CHAP. 21. [IX.]

This grace is not expiring nature, nor the slaying letter, but the vivifying spirit; for already did he possess nature with freedom of will, because he said: "To will is present with me."⁴ Nature, however, in a healthy condition and without a flaw, he did not possess, for he said: "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth nothing good."⁵ Already had he the knowledge of God's holy law, for he said: "I had not known sin but through the law;"⁶ yet for all that he did not possess strength and power to practise and fulfil righteousness, for he complained: "What I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I."⁷ And again, "How to accomplish that which is good I find not."⁸ Therefore it is not from the liberty of the human will, nor from the precepts of the law, that there arises deliverance from the body of this death; for both of these he had already,—the one in his nature, the other in his learning; but all he wanted was the help of the grace of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

CHAP. 22. [X.]—*The Synod supposed that the grace acknowledged by Pelagius was that which was so thoroughly known to the Church.*

This grace, then, which was most completely known in the Catholic Church (as the bishops were well aware), they supposed Pelagius made confession of, when they heard him say that "a man, when converted from his sins, is able by his own exertion and the grace of God to live without sin." For my

¹ Rom. vii. 23.² Rom. vii. 24, 25.³ Rom. vii. 25.⁴ Rom. vii. 18.⁵ Rom. vii. 18.⁶ Rom. vii. 7.⁷ Rom. vii. 15.⁸ Rom. vii. 18.

own part, however, I remembered the treatise which had been given to me, that I might refute it, by those servants of God, who had been Pelagius' followers.¹ They, notwithstanding their great affection for him, plainly acknowledge that the work was his; and that, on their proposing this question [to him,] because he had already given offence to very many persons from advancing views against the grace of God, he most expressly admitted that "what he meant by God's grace was the circumstance that, when our nature was created, it received [from Him] the possibility of avoiding sin, because it was created with a free will." Remembering, therefore, as I do, this treatise, I cannot help feeling still anxious, whilst many of the brethren, who are so well acquainted with his discussions, share in my anxiety, lest under the ambiguity which notoriously characterizes his words there lie some latent reserve, and lest he should afterwards tell his followers that it was without prejudice to his own doctrine that he made any admissions,—as when he said: "I no doubt asserted that a man was able by his own exertion and the grace of God to live without sin; but you know very well what I mean by grace; and you may recollect in your perusal [of my book] that grace is that [condition] in which we are created by God with a free will." Accordingly, while the bishops understood him to mean the grace by which we have by adoption been made new creatures, not that by which we were created (for most plainly does Holy Scripture instruct us in the *former* sense of grace as the true one), ignorant of his being a heretic, they acquitted him as a Catholic.² I must say that my suspicion is excited also by the circumstance, that in the work [by Pelagius] which I answered, he most openly said that "righteous Abel never sinned at all."³ Just now, however, he thus expressed himself: "But we never said that any man could be found who at no time whatever, from infancy to old age, committed sin; but that, if any man were converted from

¹ [Timasius and Jacobus, to whom Augustine addressed his book *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*.]

² [The reader may consult the treatise *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*, chapters 53 and 54, on this opinion of Pelagius.]

³ [See *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*, xxxvii. (44).]

his sins, he could by his own labour and God's grace live without sin."¹ Now, when speaking of righteous Abel, he did not say that after being converted from his sins he became sinless in a new life, but absolutely that he never committed sin at all. If, then, that book be his [in which occurs the statement about Abel,] it must of course be corrected and amended from his answer [before the synod.] I should be indeed sorry to say that he was insincere in his more recent statement; for he would probably say that he had forgotten what he had previously written in the book we have quoted. Let us therefore direct our view to what afterwards occurred. Now, from the sequel of these ecclesiastical proceedings, we can by God's help show that, although Pelagius, as some suppose, cleared himself in his examination, and was at all events acquitted by his judges (who were, however, but human beings after all), that this great heresy,² which we should be most unwilling to see making further progress or becoming aggravated in guilt, was undoubtedly itself condemned.

CHAP. 23. [XI.]—*The breviates of Cœlestius objected to Pelagius, but repudiated by him.*

Then follow sundry statements charged against Pelagius, which are said to be found among the opinions of his disciple Cœlestius: how that "Adam was created subject to death, and that he must have died whether he had sinned or not; that Adam's sin hurt only himself and not the human race; that the law no less than the gospel leads us to the kingdom [of heaven;] that there were sinless men previous to the coming of Christ; that new-born infants are in the same condition as Adam was before he fell; that the entire human race does not, on the one hand, die owing to Adam's death and transgression, nor, on the other hand, does the whole human race rise again through the resurrection of Christ." These objections against him proceeded to such a length, that they are even said to have been, after a full hearing, condemned at Carthage by your holiness and other bishops associated with you.³ I was not present on that occasion, as you will recollect; but afterwards, on my arrival at Carthage, I

¹ [See above, ch. 16. (vi.)]

² Hanc talem hæresim.

³ [Compare Augustine's work *De Peccato Originali*, ch. xi. (12).]

read over the Acts of the synod, some of which I perfectly well remember, but I hardly know whether all the tenets now mentioned occur among them. But what matters it if some of them were possibly not mentioned, and so not included in the condemnation of the synod? It is quite clear that they deserve condemnation. Sundry other points of error were next alleged against him, connected with the mention of my own name.¹ They had been transmitted to me from Sicily, some of our Catholic brethren there being perplexed by these questions; and I drew up a reply to them in a little work addressed to Hilary,² who had consulted me respecting them in a letter. My answer, in my opinion, was a sufficient one. These are the errors referred to: "That a man is able to live without sin if he likes. That infants, even if they die unbaptized, have eternal life. That rich men, even if they are baptized, unless they renounce and give up all, have, whatever good they may seem to have done, nothing of it reckoned to them; neither can they possess the kingdom of God."

CHAP. 24.

The following, as the proceedings testify, was Pelagius' own answer to these charges against him: "Concerning a man's being able indeed to live without sin, we have spoken," says he, "already; concerning the fact, however, that before the Lord's coming there were persons without sin, we say now that, previous to Christ's advent, some men lived holy and righteous lives, according to the tradition of the sacred Scriptures. The other points were never advanced by me, as even *their* testimony goes to show, to whom, however, I do not feel that I am in any way responsible. But for the satisfaction of the holy synod, I anathematize those who either now hold, or have ever held, these opinions." After hearing this answer of his, the synod said: "With regard to these charges aforesaid, Pelagius has in our presence given us sufficient and proper satisfaction, whilst he anathematizes the opinions which were none of his." We see, therefore, and firmly believe that the most dangerous points of this heresy were condemned, not only by Pelagius, but also by the holy

¹ [See same treatise as before, and same chapter.]

² [See Augustine's letter to Hilary, in *Epist.* 157.]

bishops who presided over that inquiry. The position that "Adam was made mortal;" (and, that the meaning of this statement might be more clearly understood, it was added that "he must have died whether he had sinned or not;") that his sin injured only himself and not the human race; that the law, no less than the gospel, leads us to the kingdom [of heaven;] that new-born infants are in the same condition as Adam was before he fell; that the entire human race does not, on the one hand, die in consequence of Adam's death and transgression, nor, on the other hand, does the whole human race rise again through the resurrection of Christ; that infants, even if they die unbaptized, have eternal life; that rich men, even if baptized, unless they renounce and give up all, have, whatever good they may seem to have done, nothing of it reckoned to them, neither can they possess the kingdom of God;"—all these opinions, at any rate, were clearly condemned in that ecclesiastical court,—Pelagius pronouncing the anathema, and the bishops the interlocutory sentence.

CHAP. 25. *The Pelagians falsely pretended that the Eastern Churches were on their side.*

Now, by reason of these questions, and that very contentious assertion of these tenets, which is everywhere accompanied with heated feelings, many weak brethren are disturbed. We have accordingly, in the anxiety of that love which it becomes us to feel towards the Church of Christ through His grace, and out of regard to Marcellinus of blessed memory (who used to be extremely vexed day by day by these disputers, and who used by letter to ask my advice), been obliged to write on some of these questions, and especially on the baptism of infants. On this same subject also I afterwards, at your request, and assisted by your prayers, delivered an earnest address, to the best of my ability, in the church of the *Majores*,¹ holding in my hands an epistle of the most glorious martyr Cyprian, and reading therefrom his words, on which I also largely discoursed, in order to remove this dangerous error out of the hearts of sundry persons, who had been persuaded to take up with the opinions which, as we see, were condemned in the Acts of the synod. These opinions it has been

¹ [According to another reading, "the church of *Majorinus*."]]

attempted by their promoters to force upon the minds of some of the brethren, by threatenings, as if from the Eastern Churches, that unless they adopted the said opinions, they would be formally condemned by those Churches. Observe, however, that no less than fourteen bishops of the Eastern Church,¹ assembled in synod in the land where the Lord manifested His presence in the days of His flesh, refused to acquit Pelagius unless he condemned these opinions as opposed to the Catholic faith. Since, therefore, he was then acquitted because he anathematized such views, it follows beyond a doubt that the said opinions were condemned. This, indeed, will appear more clearly still, and on still stronger evidence, in the sequel.

CHAP. 26.

Let us now see what were the two points out of all that were alleged which Pelagius refused to anathematize. He admitted them to be indeed his own opinions, but to remove their offensive aspect he explained in what sense he held them. "That a man," says he, "is able to live without sin has been asserted already." Asserted no doubt, and we remember the assertion quite well; but still it was toned down to such a degree, and approved by the judges, that God's grace was added, concerning which nothing was said in the original draft of his doctrine. Touching the second, however, of these points, we ought to pay careful attention to what he said in answer to the charge against him. "Concerning the fact, indeed," says he, "that before the Lord's coming there were persons without sin, we now again assert that previous to Christ's advent some men lived holy and righteous lives, according to the tradition of the sacred Scriptures." He did not dare to say: "We now again assert that previous to Christ's advent there were persons without sin," although this had been laid to his charge after the very words of Cœlestius. For he perceived how dangerous such a statement was, and into what trouble it would bring him. So he reduced the sentence to these harmless dimensions: "We again assert that before the coming of Christ there were persons who led holy and righteous lives." Of course there were:

¹ [Augustine mentions their names in his work *contra Julianum*, Book I. ch. v. (19).]

who would deny it? But to say this is a very different thing from saying that they lived "without sin." Because, indeed, those ancient worthies lived holy and righteous lives, they could for that very reason better confess: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."¹ In the present day, also, many men live holy and righteous lives; but yet it is no untruth they utter when in their prayer they say: "Forgive us our debts, even as we forgive our debtors."² This avowal was accordingly acceptable to the judges, in the sense in which Pelagius solemnly declared his belief; but certainly not in the sense which Cœlestius, according to the original charge against him, was said to hold. We must now treat in detail of the topics which still remain, to the best of our ability.

CHAP. 27. [XII.]

Pelagius was charged with having said: "That the Church here on earth is without spot and wrinkle." It was on this point that the Donatists also were constantly at conflict with us in our conference. We used, in their case, to lay especial stress on the mixture of bad men with good, like that of the chaff with the wheat; and we were led to this idea by the similitude of the threshing-floor. We might apply the same illustration in answer to our present opponents, unless indeed they would have the Church consist only of good men, whom they assert to be without any sin whatever, that so the Church might be without spot or wrinkle. If this be their meaning, then I repeat the same words as I quoted just now; for how can they be members of the Church, of whom the voice of a genuine humility declares, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us?"³ or how could the Church offer up that prayer which the Lord taught her to use, "Forgive us our debts,"⁴ if in this world the Church is without a spot or blemish? In short, they must themselves submit to be strictly catechised respecting themselves: do they really allow that they have any sins of their own? If their answer is in the negative, then they must be plainly told that they are deceiving them-

¹ 1 John i. 8.² Matt. vi. 12.³ 1 John i. 8.⁴ Matt. vi. 12.

selves, and the truth is not in them. If, however, they shall acknowledge that they do commit sin, what is this but a confession of their taint and blemish? They therefore are not members of the Church; because the Church is without spot and wrinkle, while they have both.

CHAP. 28.

But to this objection he replied with a watchful caution such as the Catholic judges no doubt approved. "It has," says he, "been asserted by me,—but in such a sense that the Church is by the laver of baptism cleansed from every spot and wrinkle, and in this purity the Lord wishes her to continue." Whereupon the synod said: "Of this also we approve." And who amongst us denies that in baptism the sins of all men are remitted, and that all believers come up spotless and pure from the laver of regeneration? Or what Catholic Christian is there who wishes not, as his Lord also wishes, and as it is meant to be, that the Church should remain always without spot or wrinkle? For in very deed God is now in His mercy and truth bringing it about, that His holy Church should be conducted to that perfect state in which she is to remain without spot or wrinkle for evermore. But between the laver, where all past stains and deformities are removed, and the kingdom, where the Church will remain for ever without any spot or wrinkle, there is this present intermediate time of prayer, during which her cry must of necessity be: "Forgive us our debts." Hence arose the objection against them for saying that "the Church here on earth is without spot or wrinkle;" from the doubt whether by this opinion they did not boldly prohibit that prayer whereby the Church in her present baptized state entreats day and night for herself the forgiveness of her sins. On the subject of this intervening period between the remission of sins which takes place in baptism, and the perpetuity of sinlessness which is to be in the kingdom of heaven, no proceedings ensued with Pelagius, and no decision was pronounced by the bishops. Only he thought that some brief indication ought to be given that he had not expressed himself in the way which the accusation against him seemed to state. As to his saying, "This has been asserted by me,—but in such a

sense," what else did he mean to convey than the idea that he had not in fact expressed himself in the same manner as he was supposed to have done by his accusers? The reason, however, which induced the judges to say that they were satisfied with his answer [was his confession of] baptism as the means of being washed from our sins; and of the kingdom of heaven, in which the holy Church, which is now in process of cleansing, shall continue in a sinless state for ever: this is clear from the evidence, so far as I can form an opinion.

CHAP. 29. [XIII.]

The next objections were urged out of the book of Cœlestius, following the contents of each several chapter, but rather according to the sense than the words. These indeed he expatiates on rather fully; they, however, who presented the indictment against Pelagius said that they had been unable at the moment to adduce all the words. In the first chapter, then, of Cœlestius' book they alleged that the following was written: "That we do more than is commanded us in the law and the gospel." To this Pelagius replied: "This they have set down as my statement. What we said, however, was in keeping with the apostle's assertion concerning virginity, of which Paul writes: 'I have no commandment of the Lord.'"¹ Upon this the synod said: "This also the Church receives." I have read for myself the meaning which Cœlestius gives to this in his book,—for he does not deny that the book is his. Now he made this statement obviously with the view of persuading us that we possess through the nature of our free will such a possibility of avoiding sin, that we are able to do more than is commanded us; for a perpetual virginity is maintained by very many persons, and this is not commanded; whereas, in order to avoid sin, it is sufficient to fulfil what is commanded. When the judges, however, accepted Pelagius' answer, they did not take it to convey the idea that those persons keep all the commandments of the law and the gospel who over and above maintain the state of virginity, which is not commanded,—but only this, that virginity, which is not commanded, is something more than conjugal chastity, which is commanded; so that to observe

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 25.

the one is of course more than to keep the other; whereas, at the same time, neither can be maintained without the grace of God, inasmuch as the apostle, in speaking of this very subject, says: "But I would that all men were even as I myself. Every man, however, hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that."¹ And even the Lord Himself, upon the disciples remarking, "If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry" (or, as the Latin better expresses it, "*non expedit ducere*"),² said to them: "All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given."³ This, therefore, is the doctrine which the bishops of the synod declared to be received by the Church, that the state of virginity, persevered in to the last, which is not commanded, is more than the chastity of married life, which is commanded. In what view Pelagius or Cœlestius regarded this subject, the judges were not aware.

CHAP. 30. [XIV.]—*The more prominent points of Cœlestius' work.*

After this we find objected against Pelagius some other points of Cœlestius' teaching,—prominent ones, and undoubtedly worthy of condemnation; such, indeed, as would certainly have involved Pelagius in condemnation, if he had not anathematized them in the synod. Under his third head Cœlestius was alleged to have written: "That God's grace and assistance is not given for single actions, but is imparted in the freedom of the will, or in the law and in doctrine." And again: "That God's grace is given in proportion to our deserts; because, were He to give it to sinful persons, He would evidently be unrighteous." And from these words he inferred that "therefore grace itself has been placed in my own will, according as I have been either worthy or unworthy of it. For if we do all things by grace, then whenever we are overcome by sin, it is not *we* who are overcome, but God's grace, which wanted by all means to help us, but was actually

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 7.

² ["Not expedient to take a wife." This "better expression" Augustine substitutes for the reading "*non expedit nubere*," as applied to a woman's taking a husband. The original, *γαμῆσαι* [not *γαμείσθαι*], justifies Augustine's preference.]

³ Matt. xix. 10, 11.

unable." And once more he says: "If, when we conquer sin, it is by the grace of God; therefore it is He who is in fault whenever we are vanquished by sin, because He was either altogether unable or wholly unwilling to keep us safe." To these charges Pelagius replied: "Whether these are really the opinions of Cœlestius or not, is the concern of those who say that they are. For my own part, indeed, I never entertained such views; on the contrary, I anathematize every one who does entertain them." Then the synod said: "This holy synod accepts you for your condemnation of these impious words." Now certainly there can be no mistake, in regard to these opinions, either as to the clear way in which Pelagius pronounced on them his anathema, or as to the absolute terms in which the bishops condemned them. It is left quite in doubt, or in the dark, whether Pelagius ever held these sentiments, or still holds them,—or Cœlestius, or both of them, or neither, or other persons with them, or in their name. By this judgment of the bishops, however, it has been declared plainly enough that the opinions in question were condemned, and that Pelagius would have been condemned along with them, unless he had himself actually condemned them too. Now, after this trial, it is certain that whenever we enter on a controversy touching opinions of this kind, we only discuss an already condemned heresy.

CHAP. 31.

I shall make my next remark with greater satisfaction. In a former section I expressed a fear¹ that, when Pelagius said that "a man was able by the help of God's grace to live without sin," he perhaps meant by the term "grace" the capability possessed by nature as created by God with a free will, as it is understood in that book which I received as his, and to which I replied;² and that by these means he was deceiving the judges, who were ignorant of the circumstances. Now, however, since he anathematizes those persons who hold that "God's grace and assistance is not given for single actions, but is imparted in the freedom of the will,

¹ [See above, (20).]

² [He refers to Pelagius' work which Augustine received from Jacobus and Timasius, and against which he wrote his treatise *De Naturâ et Gratiâ*.]

or in the law and in doctrine," it is quite evident that he really means the grace which is preached in the Church of Christ, and is conferred by the ministration of the Holy Ghost, for the purpose of helping us in each detail of our conduct, whence it is that we pray for needful and suitable grace that we enter not into any temptation. Nor, again, have I any longer a fear that, when he said, "No man can be without sin unless he has acquired a knowledge of the law," and added this explanation of his words, that "he perhaps regarded a knowledge of the law as a help towards the avoidance of sin,"¹ he at all meant the said knowledge to be considered as tantamount to the grace of God; for, observe, he anathematizes such as hold this opinion. See, too, how he refuses to hold our natural free will, or the law and doctrine, as equivalent to that grace of God which helps us through our single actions. What else then is left to him but to understand that grace which the apostle tells us is given by "the supply [or administration] of the Spirit?"² This is what the Lord meant when He said: "Take no thought how or what ye shall speak; for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."³ Nor, again, need I be under any apprehension that, when he asserted, "All men are ruled by their own will," and afterwards explained that he had made that statement "in the interest of the freedom of our will, of which God is the helper whenever it makes choice of good,"⁴ that he perhaps here also held God's helping grace as synonymous with our natural free will and the teaching of the law. For inasmuch as he rightly anathematized the persons who hold that God's grace or assistance is not given for single actions, but lies [generally] in the gift of free will, or in the law and doctrine, it follows, of course, that God's grace or assistance is given us for single actions,—free will, or the law and the doctrine, being left out of all consideration in such a matter; and thus through all the particulars of our life, when we act rightly, we are ruled and directed by God; nor is our prayer a useless one,

¹ [See above, (2).]

³ Matt. x. 19, 20.

² Phil. i. 19 [*ἐπιχορηγία τ. Πν.*].

⁴ [See above, (5).]

wherein we say: "Order my steps, [O Lord,] according to Thy word, and let not any iniquity have dominion over me."¹

CHAP. 32.

But what comes afterwards again fills me with anxiety. On its being objected to him, from the fifth chapter of Cœlestius' book, that "they say every individual has the faculty of possessing all powers and graces, thus taking away that 'diversity of gifts' which the apostle sets forth," Pelagius replied: "We have certainly said so much; but yet they have laid against us a malignant and blundering charge. We do not take away the diversity of gifts; but we declare that God gives to the person, who has proved himself worthy to receive them, all graces, even as He conferred them on the Apostle Paul." Hereupon the synod said: "You accordingly do yourself hold the doctrine of the Church touching the gift of the graces, which are collectively possessed by the apostle." Here some one may say, Why then is he anxious? Do you on your side deny that all the powers and graces were combined in the apostle? For my own part, indeed, if all those are to be understood which the apostle has himself mentioned together in one passage,—as, I suppose, the bishops understood Pelagius to mean when they approved of his answer, and pronounced it to be in keeping with the sense of the Church,—then I do not doubt that the apostle had them all; for he says: "And God hath set some in the Church, first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."² What then shall we say, that the Apostle Paul did not possess all these gifts himself? Who would be bold enough to assert this? The very fact that he was an apostle showed, of course, that he possessed the grace of the apostolate. He possessed also the gift of prophecy; for was not that a prophecy of his in which he says: "In the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils?"³ He was, moreover, "the teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity."⁴ He performed miracles also and cures; for he shook off from his

¹ Ps. cxix. 133.² 1 Cor. xii. 28.³ 1 Tim. iv. 1.⁴ 1 Tim. ii. 7.

hand, unhurt, the biting viper;¹ and the cripple [of Lystra] stood upright on his feet at the apostle's word, and his strength was at once restored.² It is not clear what he means by "*helps*," for the term is of very wide application; but who can say that he was wanting even in this grace, when through his labours such helps were manifestly afforded towards the salvation of mankind? Then as to his possessing the grace of "*government*," what could be more excellent than his administration, when the Lord at that time governed so many churches by his personal agency, and governs them still in our day through his epistles? And in respect of the "*diversities* [or kinds] *of tongues*," what tongues could have been wanting to him, when he says himself: "I thank my God that I speak with tongues more than you all?"³ It being thus inevitable to suppose that not one of these gifts and graces was wanting to the Apostle Paul, the judges approved of Pelagius' answer, wherein he said "that all graces were conferred upon him." But there are other graces in addition to these which are not mentioned here. For it is not to be supposed, however greatly the Apostle Paul excelled others as a member of Christ's body, that the very Head itself of the entire body did not receive more and ampler graces still, whether in His flesh or His soul as man; for such a created nature did the Word of God assume as His own into union with His [divine] Person, that He might so be our Head, and we His body. And in very deed, if all gifts could be in each member, it would be evident that the similitude, which is used to illustrate this subject, of the several members of our body is inapplicable; for some things are common to the members in general, such as life and health, whilst other things are peculiar to the separate members, since the ear has no perception of colours, nor the eye of voices. Hence it is written: "If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? if the whole were hearing, where were the smelling?"⁴ Now this of course is not said as if it were impossible for God to impart to the ear the sense of seeing, or to the eye the function of hearing. However, what He does in Christ's body, which is the Church,

¹ Acts xxviii. 5.² Acts xiv. 8, 9.³ 1 Cor. xiv. 18.⁴ 1 Cor. xii. 17.

and what the apostle meant by diversity of graces,¹ as if through the different members, that there might be gifts proper even to every one separately, is clearly known. Why, too, and on what ground they who raised the objection were so unwilling to have taken away all difference in graces, why, moreover, the bishops of the synod were able to approve of the answer given by Pelagius in deference to the Apostle Paul, in whom we admit the combination of all those graces which he mentioned in the one particular passage, is by this time clear also.

CHAP. 33.

What, then, is the reason why, as I said just now, I felt anxious on the subject of this head of his doctrine? It is occasioned by what Pelagius says in these words: "That God gives to the man, who has proved himself worthy to receive them, all graces, even as He conferred them on the Apostle Paul." Now, I should not have felt any anxiety about this answer of Pelagius, if it were not closely connected with the cause which we are bound to guard with the utmost care—even that God's grace may never be attacked, while we are silent or dissembling in respect of so great an evil. As, therefore, he does not say, that God gives to whom He will, but that "God gives to the man, *who has proved himself worthy to receive them*, all these gifts," I could not help being suspicious, when I read such words. For the very name of grace, and the thing that is meant by it, is taken away, if it is not bestowed gratuitously, but he only receives it who is worthy of the gift. Will anybody say that I do the apostle wrong, because I do not admit him to have been worthy of grace? Nay, I should indeed rather do him wrong, and bring on myself a punishment, if I refused to believe what he himself says. Well, now, has he not pointedly so defined *grace* as to show that it is so called because it is bestowed gratuitously? These are his own very words: "And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace."² In accordance with this, he says again: "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt."³

[Another reading has *Ecclesiarum*, instead of *gratiarum*; *q.d.* "difference in churches."]

² Rom. xi. 6.

³ Rom. iv. 4.

If any man, however, is worthy of grace, there is a debt of it due to him; and if it is thus due to him, it ceases to be grace; for grace is freely given, but a debt is paid as due. Grace, therefore, is bestowed on those who are unworthy, that a debt may be paid to them when they become worthy. He, however, who has bestowed on the unworthy the gifts which they possessed not before, does Himself take care that they shall have whatever things He means to recompense to them when they become worthy.

CHAP. 34.—*On the works of unbelievers; faith is the initial principle from which good works have their beginning; faith is the gift of God's grace.*

He will perhaps say: It was not because of his works, but in consequence of his faith, that I said the apostle was worthy of having all those great graces bestowed upon him. His faith deserved this distinction, but not his works, which were not good previous [to his faith]. Well, then, are we to suppose that faith does not produce any works? Surely faith does work in a very real way, for it "worketh by love."¹ Preach up, however, as much as you like, the works of unbelieving men, we still know how true and invincible is the statement of this same apostle: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."² The very reason, indeed, why he so often declares that righteousness is imputed to us, not because of our works, but our faith, whereas faith rather works through love, is that no man should think that he arrives at faith itself through the merit of his works; for it is faith which is the initial principle whence good works first proceed; since (as has already been stated) whatsoever comes not from faith itself is sin. Accordingly, it is said to the Church, in the Song of Songs: "Thou shalt come and pass by from the beginning of faith."³ Although, therefore, faith procures the grace of producing good works, we do not deserve by our faith that we should have faith itself bestowed upon us; but, in its bestowal upon us, in order that we might follow the Lord by its help, "His mercy has prevented us."⁴ Was it we ourselves that gave it to us? Did we ourselves make ourselves faithful? I must

¹ Gal. v. 6.

² Rom. xiv. 23.

³ [Ἐλεύση καὶ διελύση ἀπὸ ἀρχῆς πίστεως.] Cant. iv. 8 (Sept.).

⁴ Ps. lix. 10.

by all means at this idea emphatically say: "It is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves."¹ And indeed nothing else than this is pressed upon us in the apostle's teaching, when he says: "For I declare, through the grace that is given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith."² Whence, too, arises the well-known challenge: "What hast thou that thou didst not receive?"³ inasmuch as we have received even that which is the spring from which everything we have of good in our actions takes its beginning.

CHAP. 35.

What, then, is the meaning of that which the same apostle says: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day"⁴ If this is not a recompense paid to the worthy, is it anyhow a gift bestowed on the unworthy? He who says this, does not consider that the crown could not have been given to the man who is worthy of it, unless grace had been first bestowed on him whilst unworthy of it. He says indeed: "I have fought a good fight;"⁵ but then he also says: "Thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."⁶ He says too: "I have finished my course;" but he says again: "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy."⁷ He says, moreover: "I have kept the faith;" but then it is he too who says again: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep my deposit against that day"—that is, "what I have committed to His keeping;" for some copies have not the word *depositum*, but *commendatum*, which yields a plainer sense.⁸ Now, what do we commit to God's keeping, except the things which we pray Him to preserve for us, and amongst these our

¹ Ps. c. 3.² Rom. xii. 3.³ 1 Cor. iv. 7.⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 7.⁵ 2 Tim. iv. 7.⁶ 1 Cor. xv. 57.⁷ Rom. ix. 16.

⁸ 2 Tim. i. 12. [St. Paul's phrase, *τὴν παραθήκην μου*, has been taken in two senses, as (1) what God had entrusted to him; and (2) what the apostle had entrusted to God's keeping. St. Augustine, it will be seen, here takes the latter sense.]

very faith? For what else did the Lord procure for the Apostle Peter by His prayer for him,¹ of which He said, "I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not,"² than that God would preserve his faith, that it should not fail by giving way to temptation? Therefore, blessed Paul, thou great preacher of grace, I will say it without fear of any man (for who will be less angry with me for so saying than thyself, who hast told us what to say, and taught us what to teach?)—I will, I repeat, say it, and fear no man for the assertion: Thy merits are recompensed with their own crown of reward; but thy merits are the gifts of God!

CHAP. 36.—*The monk Pelagius. Grace is conferred on the unworthy.*

His due reward, therefore, is recompensed to the apostle as worthy of it; but still it was grace which bestowed on him the apostleship itself, which was not his due, and of which he was not worthy. Shall I be sorry for having said this? God forbid! For under his own testimony shall I find a ready protection from such reproach; nor will any man charge me with audacity, unless he be himself audacious enough to charge the apostle with mendacity. He frankly says, nay he protests, that he commends the gifts within himself as God's gifts, so that he glories not in himself at all, but glories in the Lord;³ he not only declares that he possessed no good deserts in himself why he should be made an apostle, but he even mentions his own demerits, in order to manifest and preach the grace of God. "I am not meet," says he, "to be called an apostle;"⁴ and what else does this mean than "I am not *worthy*"?—as indeed several Latin copies read the phrase. Now this, to be sure, is the very gist of our question; for undoubtedly in this grace of apostleship all those graces are contained [which are the subject of our discussion]. For it was neither convenient nor right that an apostle should not possess the gift of *prophecy*, nor be a *teacher*, nor be illustrious for *miracles* and *the gifts of healings*, nor furnish need-

¹ [There seems to be a corruption in the text here: "*Quid aliud apostolo Petro Dominus commendavit orando.*" Another reading inserts *de* before the word *apostolo*. Our version is rather of the apparent sense than of the words of the passage.]

² Luke xxii. 32.

³ 1 Cor. i. 31.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 9.

ful *helps*, nor provide *governments* over the churches, nor excel in *diversities of tongues*. All these functions the one name of apostleship embraces. Let us, therefore, consult the man himself, nay listen wholly to him. Let us say to him: Holy Apostle Paul, the monk Pelagius declares that thou wast worthy to receive all the graces of thine apostleship. What dost thou say thyself? He answers: "I am not worthy to be called an apostle." Shall I then, under pretence of honouring Paul, in a matter concerning Paul, dare to believe Pelagius in preference to Paul? I will not do so; for if I did, I should only prove to be more onerous to myself than honourable to him.¹ Let us hear also why he is not worthy to be called an apostle: "Because," says he, "I persecuted the Church of God."² Now, were we to follow up the idea here expressed, who would not judge that he rather deserved from Christ condemnation, instead of an apostolic call? Who could so love the preacher as not to loathe the persecutor? Well, therefore, and truly does he say of himself: "I am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God." As thou wroughtest then such evil, how camest thou to earn such good? Let all men hear his answer: "But by the grace of God, I am what I am." Is there, then, no other way in which grace is commended, than because it is conferred on an unworthy recipient? "And His grace," he adds, "which was bestowed on me was not in vain."³ He says the same thing as a lesson to others also, to show them that their will is free to choose, when he says: "We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain."⁴ Whence however does he derive his proof, that "His grace bestowed on himself was not in vain," except from the fact which he goes on to mention: "But I laboured more abundantly than they all?"⁵ So it seems he did not labour in order to receive grace, but he received grace in order that he might labour. And thus, when unworthy, he gratuitously received grace, whereby he might become worthy to receive

¹ [This is a poor imitation of Augustine's playful words: "Me potius *onerabo* quam illum *honorabo*."]

² 1 Cor. xv. 9.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 1.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

the due rewards [of his labours]. Not that he ventured even to claim aught for his labour; for, after saying: "I laboured more abundantly than they all," he at once subjoined: "Yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me."¹ O mighty teacher, confessor, and preacher of grace! What meaneth this: "I laboured more, yet not I?" Where the will exalted itself ever so little, there piety was instantly on the watch, and humility trembled, because infirmity confessed all the truth.

CHAP. 37.—*John, Bishop of Jerusalem.*

With great propriety, as the proceedings show, did John, the holy bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, employ the authority of this same passage of the apostle, as he himself told our brethren the bishops who were his assessors at that trial, on their asking him what proceedings had taken place before him previous to the trial.² He told them that on the occasion in question, whilst some were whispering, and remarking on Pelagius' statement, that "without God's grace man was able to attain perfection" (that is, as he had previously expressed it, "man was able to live without sin"), he censured the statement, and reminded them besides, that even the Apostle Paul, after so many labours—not indeed in his own strength, but by the grace of God—said: "I laboured more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me;"³ and in another passage: "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy;"⁴ and [he also reminded them] of that passage in the Psalm: "Except the Lord build the house, they labour but in vain who build it."⁵ And he added: "We quoted several other like passages out of the Holy Scriptures. When, however, they did not receive the quotations which we made out of the Holy Scriptures, but continued their murmuring noise, Pelagius said: 'This also is what I believe; let him be anathema, who declares that a man is able, without God's help, to arrive at the perfection of all virtues.'"

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

² [In a conference held at Jerusalem at the end of July in the year 415, as described by Orosius in his *Apology*.]

³ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

⁴ Rom. ix. 16.

⁵ Ps. cxxvii. 1.

CHAP. 38. [XV.]

Bishop John narrated all this in the hearing of Pelagius; but he, of course, might respectfully say: Your holiness is in error; you do not accurately remember the facts. It was not in reference to the passages of Scripture which you have quoted that I uttered the words: "This also is what I believe." Because this is not my opinion of them. I do not understand them to say, that God's grace so co-operates with man, that his abstinence from sin is due, not to "him that willeth, nor to him that runneth, but to God that showeth mercy."¹

CHAP. 39. [XVI.]—*Heros and Lazarus; Orosius.*

For there are some commentaries on Paul's Epistle to the Romans which are said to have been written by Pelagius himself.² In one of these he asserts, that the passage: "Not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy," was not a statement of Paul's own meaning; but that he therein employed the language of controversy and refutation, as if implying that such a statement could not be properly made. No safe conclusion, therefore, can be drawn, although the bishop John plainly acknowledged the passage in question as conveying the mind of the apostle, and mentioned it for the very purpose of hindering Pelagius from thinking that any man can avoid sin without God's grace, and declared that Pelagius said in answer: "This also is what I believe." Nor, indeed, upon hearing all this did he repudiate his admission by replying: This is not my belief. He ought, indeed, either to deny altogether, or unhesitatingly to correct and amend the above mentioned exposition, in which he would have it, that the apostle must not be regarded as entertaining the sentiment [of the passage quoted from his epistle],³ but only as refuting it. Now, whatever Bishop John said of our brethren who were absent—whether our brother bishops Heros and Lazarus, or the presbyter Orosius, or any others whose names are not registered in the Acts,⁴—I am sure that he did not mean it to operate to their prejudice. For, had they been

¹ Rom. ix. 16.² [See the treatise *De Peccatorum meritis*, iii. 1.]³ Rom. ix. 16.⁴ [Avitus, perhaps, Passerius, and Dominus ex duce, whose names do not occur in the Acts of the Synod of Diospolis, but are mentioned by Orosius, *Apol.* 3.]

present, they might possibly (God forbid that I should say it absolutely) have convicted him of untruth; at any rate they might perhaps have reminded him of something he had forgotten, or something in which he might have been deceived by the Latin interpreter: not, to be sure, for the purpose of misleading him by untruth, but at least, owing to some difficulty occasioned by a foreign language, only imperfectly understood; especially as the question was not treated in the Acts,¹ which were drawn up for the useful purpose of preventing deceit on the part of evil men, and of preserving a record to assist the memory of good men. If, however, any man shall be disposed by this mention of our brethren to introduce any question or doubt on the subject in question, and summon them before the Episcopal judgment, they will not be wanting to themselves, as occasion shall serve. Why need we here pursue the point, when not even the judges themselves, after the narrative of our brother bishop, were inclined to pronounce any definite sentence in consequence of it?

CHAP. 40. [XVII.]

Since, then, Pelagius was present when these [decisive] passages of the Scriptures were discussed, and by his silence acknowledged having said that he entertained the same view of their meaning, how happens it, that, after reconsidering the apostle's testimony, as he had just done, and finding that he said: "I am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God; but by the grace of God I am what I am,"² he did not perceive that it was improper for him to say, respecting the question of the abundance of the graces and gifts which the said apostle received, that he had shown himself "worthy to receive them," when the apostle himself not only confessed, but added a reason to prove, that he was *unworthy* of them—and by this very fact set forth grace *as grace indeed?* If he could not for some reason or other consider or recollect the narrative of his holiness the bishop John, which he had heard some time before,

¹ [Augustine here refers to the *Acts* of the conference at Jerusalem before its bishop John, which sat previous to the Council of Diospolis. See above, 37 (xiv.).]

² 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10.

he might surely show some deference to his own very recent answer at the synod, and remember how he anathematized, but a short time since, the opinions which had been alleged against him out of Cœlestius. Now among these it was objected to him that Cœlestius had said: "That the grace of God is bestowed according to our merits." If, then, Pelagius was sincere in his condemnation of this doctrine by his anathema, why does he say that all those graces were conferred on the apostle because he deserved them? Is the phrase "worthy to receive" of different meaning from the expression "to receive according to merit"? Can he by any disputatious subtlety show that a man is worthy who has no merit? But neither Cœlestius, nor any other, whose opinions he anathematized at one swoop, has any intention to allow him to throw clouds over the phrase, and to conceal himself behind them. He presses home the matter, and plainly says: "Grace has been actually placed in my own will, according as I have been either worthy or unworthy of it." If, then, a statement, wherein it is declared that "God's grace is given in proportion to our deserts, to such as are worthy,"¹ was rightly and truly condemned by Pelagius, how could his heart permit him to think, or his mouth to utter, such a sentence as this: "God gives to the person who has proved himself worthy to receive them, all graces?"² Who that carefully considers all this can help feeling some anxiety about his answer or defence?

CHAP. 41.—*Augustine indulgently shows that the judges acted incautiously in their official conduct of the case of Pelagius.*

Why, then (some one will say), did the judges approve of this? I confess that I hardly even now understand why they did. It is, however, not to be wondered at, if some brief word or phrase too easily escaped their attention and ear; or if, because they thought it capable of being somehow interpreted in a correct sense, from seeming to have from the accused himself such clear confessions of truth on the subject, they decided it to be hardly worth while to excite a discussion about a word. The same feeling might have occurred to ourselves also, if we had sat with them at the trial. For if, instead of the term *worthy*, the word *predestinated* had been

¹ [See above, 30 (xiv.).]

² [See above, 32.]

used, or some such word, my mind would certainly not have entertained any doubt, much less have been disquieted by it; and yet if it were asserted, that he who is justified by the election of grace is called *worthy*, through no antecedent merits of good indeed, but by [God's] destination, just as he is called "elect," it would be really difficult to determine whether he might be so designated at all, or at least with very little offence to an intelligent view of the subject.

As for myself, indeed, I might readily pass on from the discussion on this word, were it not that the treatise which called forth my reply, and in which he says that God's grace is nothing else whatever than our own nature with its free-will gratuitously created,¹ made me suspicious and anxious about the actual meaning of Pelagius—whether he had procured the introduction of the term into the argument without any accurate intention as to its sense, or else as a carefully drawn dogmatic expression. [But to proceed], the last remaining statements had such an effect on the judges, that they deemed them worthy of condemnation, without waiting for Pelagius' answer.

CHAP. 42. [XVIII.]—*Other heads of Cœlestius' doctrine abjured by Pelagius.*

For it was objected that in the sixth chapter of Cœlestius' work there was laid down this position: "Men cannot be called sons of God, unless they have entirely become free from all sin." It follows from this statement, that not even the Apostle Paul is a child of God, since he said: "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect."² In the seventh chapter he makes this statement: "Forgetfulness and ignorance have no connection with sin, as they do not happen through the will, but occur of necessity;" although David says: "Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my sins of ignorance;"³ although too, in the law, sacrifices are offered for ignorance, as if for sin.⁴ In his eleventh chapter he says: "Our will cannot be free, if it requires the help of God; inasmuch as every one in the

¹ [We have preferred the reading *gratis creatam* to the obscure *gratiam creaturam*.]

² Phil. iii. 12.

³ Ps. xxv. 7.

⁴ See Lev. iv.

possession of his proper will has either something to do or to abstain from doing." In the twelfth he says: "Our victory comes not from God's help, but from our own free-will." And this is a conclusion which he was said to draw in the following terms: "The victory is ours, seeing that we took up arms of our own will and accord; just as, on the other hand, being conquered is our own, since it was of our own will and accord that we neglected to arm ourselves." And, after quoting the phrase of the Apostle Peter, "partakers of the divine nature,"¹ he is said to have made out of it this argument: "Now since our spirit or soul is unable to be without sin, therefore even God is subject to sin, since this part of Him, that is to say the spirit or soul, is exposed to sin." In his thirteenth chapter he says: "That pardon is not given to penitents according to the grace and mercy of God, but according to their own merits and effort, since through repentance they have been worthy of mercy."

CHAP. 43. [XIX.]—*The answer of the monk Pelagius and his profession of faith.*

After all these sentences were read out, the synod said: "What says the monk Pelagius to all these heads of opinion which have been read in his presence? For this holy synod condemns the whole, as does also God's Holy Catholic Church." Pelagius answered: "I say again, that these opinions, even according to their own showing, are not mine; nor for them, as I have already said, am I to be held responsible. The opinions which I have confessed to be my own, I maintain are sound and correct; those, however, which I have said are not my own, I reject according to the judgment of this holy synod, pronouncing anathema on every man who opposes and gainsays the doctrines of the Holy Catholic Church. For I believe in the Trinity of the One Divine substance, and I hold all things in accordance with the teaching of the Holy Catholic Church. If indeed any man entertains opinions different from that doctrine, let him be anathema."

CHAP. 44. [XX.]—*The acquittal of Pelagius.*

The synod said: "Now since we have received satisfaction on the points which have come before us touching the

¹ 2 Pet. i. 4.

monk Pelagius, who has been present ; since, too, he gives his consent to the doctrines of godliness, and anathematizes everything that is contrary to the Church's faith, we pronounce him to belong to the communion of the Catholic Church."

CHAP. 45. [XXI.]—*Pelagius' acquittal becomes suspected.*

If these proceedings were conducted in such a manner as to induce Pelagius' friends to rejoice in his exculpation by them, we, on our part, undoubtedly desire and pray for his salvation in Christ ; and he certainly took much pains to prove that we were well affected towards him, by going so far as to produce even our private letters to him, and reading them at the trial. As regards his acquittal, however, which is rather believed than clearly shown to be deserved, we ought not to be in a hurry to exult in it. When I say this, indeed, I do not charge the judges either with negligence or connivance, or with consciously holding unsound doctrine—which they most certainly would be the very last to entertain. But although by their sentence Pelagius is held by those who are on terms of fullest and closest intimacy with him to have been acquitted, as he deserved to be, with the approval and even commendation of his judges, he certainly does not appear to me to have been cleared of the charges brought against him. They conducted his trial as of one whom they knew nothing of, especially in the absence of those who had prepared the indictment against him, and were quite unable to examine him with diligence and care ; but, in spite of this inability, they completely quashed the heresy itself, as even the defenders of his perverseness must allow, if they only follow the judgment through its particulars. As for those persons, however, who well know what Pelagius has been in the habit of teaching, or who have had to oppose his contentious efforts, or those who, to their joy, have escaped from his erroneous doctrine, how can they possibly help suspecting him, when they read the affected confession, wherein he acknowledges past errors, but so expressed as if he had never entertained any other opinion than those which he stated in his replies to the satisfaction of the judges ?

CHAP. 46. [XXII.]—*How Pelagius became known to Augustine ; Cœlestius condemned at Carthage.*

Now, that I may especially refer to my own relation to him, I first became acquainted with Pelagius' name at a distance, and when he was living at Rome ; it was mentioned with much commendation and respect. Afterwards reports began to reach us, that he was a frequent disputant against the grace of God. This caused me much pain, for I could not refuse to believe the statements of my informants ; but yet I was desirous of ascertaining information on the matter either from himself or from some treatise of his, that, in case I should have to discuss the question with him, it should be on grounds which he could not disown. On his arrival, however, in Africa, he was in my absence kindly received on our coast of Hippo, where, as I found from our brethren, nothing whatever of his unfavourable character had been heard of him ; he left, however, earlier than was expected. On a subsequent occasion, indeed, I caught a glimpse of him, once or twice, to the best of my recollection, when I was very much occupied in preparing for a conference which we were to hold with the heretical Donatists ; but he hastened away across the sea. Meanwhile the doctrines connected with his name were warmly maintained, and passed from mouth to mouth, among his reputed followers—to such an extent that Cœlestius found his way before an ecclesiastical tribunal, and developed opinions well suited to his perverse character. We thought it would be a better way of proceeding against them, if, without mentioning any names of individuals, the errors themselves were met and refuted ; that the [misguided] persons might thus be brought to a right mind by the fear of a condemnation from the Church rather than by the punishment actually administered on them. And so both by books and by popular discussions we ceased not to oppose the evil doctrines in question.

CHAP. 47. [XXIII.]—*Pelagius' book, which was sent by Timasius and Jacobus to Augustine, was answered by the latter in his work "On Nature and Grace."*

But when there was actually placed in my hands, by those faithful servants of God and honourable men, Timasius and

Jacobus, the treatise in which Pelagius dealt with the question of God's grace, it became very evident to me—too evident, indeed, to admit of any further doubt—how hostile to salvation by Christ was his poisonous perversion of the truth. He treated the subject in the shape of an objection started, as if by an opponent, in his own terms against himself; for he was already suffering a good deal of obloquy from his opinions on the question, which he now appeared to solve for himself in no other way than by simply describing the grace of God as nature created [by God] with a free-will, occasionally combining therewith either the help of the law, or even the remission of sins; although these additional admissions were not plainly made, but only sparingly suggested by him. And yet, even under these circumstances, I refrained from inserting Pelagius' name in my work, wherein I refuted this book of his; for I still thought that I should render a prompter assistance to the truth if I continued to preserve a friendly relation to him, and so to spare his personal feelings, while at the same time I showed no mercy, as I was bound not to show it, to the productions of his pen. Hence, I must say, I now feel some annoyance, that in this trial he somewhere said: "I anathematize those who hold these opinions, or have at any time held them." He might have been contented with saying, "*Those who hold these opinions,*" which we should have regarded in the light of a self-censure; but when he went on to say, "*Or have at any time held them,*" [I cannot help asking], in the first place, how he could dare to condemn so unjustly those harmless persons who no longer held the errors, which they had learnt either from others, or actually from himself? And, in the second place, [I must inquire] who among all those persons that were aware of the fact of his not only having held the opinions in question, but of his having taught them, could help suspecting, and not unreasonably, that he must have acted insincerely in condemning those who now held those opinions, seeing that he did not hesitate to condemn in the same strain and at the same moment those also who had at any time previously held them, when they would be sure to remember that they had no less a person than himself as

their instructor in these errors? There are, for instance, such persons as Timasius and Jacobus, to say nothing of any others. How can he with unblushing face look at them, his dear friends (who have never relinquished their love of him) and his former disciples? These are the persons to whom I addressed the work in which I replied to the statements of [Pelagius'] book. I think I ought not to pass over in silence the style and tone which they observed towards me in their correspondence, and I have here added a letter of theirs as a sample.

CHAP. 48. [XXIV.]—*A letter written by Timasius and Jacobus to Augustine on receiving his treatise "On Nature and Grace."*

"To his lordship, the truly blessed and deservedly venerable father, Bishop Augustine, Timasius and Jacobus send greeting in the Lord. We have been so greatly refreshed and strengthened by the grace of God, which your word has ministered to us, my lord, our truly blessed and justly venerated father, that we may with the utmost sincerity and propriety say, 'He sent His word and healed them.'¹ We have found, indeed, that your holiness has so thoroughly sifted the contents of his poor worthless book as to astonish us with the answers with which even the slightest points of his error have been confronted, whether it be on matters which every Christian ought to rebut, loathe, and avoid, or on those in which he is not with sufficient certainty found to have erred,—although even in these he has, with incredible subtlety, suggested his belief that God's grace should be kept out of sight.² There is, however, one consideration which affects us under so great a benefit, that this most illustrious gift of the grace of God has, however slowly, so fully shone out upon us. If, indeed, it has happened that some are removed from the influence of this clearest light of truth, whose blind condition required its illumination, yet even to them, we doubt not, the same grace will find its steady way, however late, by the merciful favour of that God 'who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth.'³ As for ourselves, indeed, thanks to that loving spirit which is in you, we have, in consequence of your instruction, some time since thrown off our

¹ Ps. cvii. 20.

² Supprimendam.

³ 1 Tim. ii. 4.

subjection to his errors; but we still have even now cause for continued gratitude in the fact that, as we have been informed, the false opinions which we formerly believed are now becoming apparent to others—a way of escape opening out to them in the extremely precious discourse of your holiness.” Then, in another hand, [comes this conclusion]: “May the mercy of our God keep your blessedness in safety, and mindful of us, for His eternal glory.”¹

CHAP. 49. [XXV.]

If now even that man² were to confess that he had once been implicated in this error as a person possessed, but that he now anathematized all that held these opinions, whoever should withhold his congratulation from him, now that he was in possession of the way of truth, would surely surrender all the instincts of charity. As the case, however, now stands, he has not only not acknowledged his liberation from his pestilential error; but, as if that were a small thing, he has gone on to anathematize men who have reached that freedom, who love him so well that they would fain desire his own emancipation. Amongst these are those very men who have expressed their good-will towards him in the [above-mentioned] letter, which they forwarded to me. For he it was whom they had chiefly in view when they said how much they were affected at the fact of my having at last written that work. “If, indeed, it has happened,” they say, “that some are removed from the influence of this clearest light of truth, whose blind condition required its illumination, yet even to them,” they go on to remark, “we doubt not, the self-same grace will find its way, by the merciful favour of God.” Any name, or names, even they too thought it desirable as yet to suppress, in order that, if friendship still lived on, the error of the friends might the more surely die.

CHAP. 50.—*Pelagius has no good reason to be annoyed if his name be at last used in the controversy, and he be expressly refuted; concerning the Epistles which were written to him by the Bishops.*

But now if Pelagius thinks of God, if he is not ungrateful for His mercy in having brought him before this tribunal of

¹ [See Augustine's Epist. 168.]

² Pelagius.

the bishops, that thus he might be saved from the hardihood of afterwards defending these anathematized opinions, and be at once led to acknowledge them as deserving of abhorrence and rejection, he will be more thankful to us for a letter in which, by mentioning his name, we shall open the wound in order to cure it, than for one in which we were afraid to cause him pain, and, in fact, only produced irritation,—a result which causes us regret. Should he, however, feel angry with us, let him reflect how unfair such anger is; and, in order to subdue it, let him ask God to give him that grace which, in this trial, he has confessed to be necessary for each one of our actions, that so by His assistance he may gain a real victory. For of what use to him are all those great laudations contained in the letters of the bishops, which he thought fit to be mentioned, and even to be read and quoted in his favour,—as if all those persons who heard his strong and, to some extent, earnest exhortations to goodness of life could not have easily discovered how perverse were the opinions which he was entertaining?

CHAP. 51. [XXVI.]

For my own part, indeed, in the letter which he produced, I not only abstained from all praises of him, but I even exhorted him, with as much earnestness as I could, short of actually mooting the question, to cultivate right views about the grace of God. In my salutation I called him *Dominus*,¹—a title which, in our epistolary style, we usually apply even to some persons who are not Christians,—and this without untruth, inasmuch as we do, in a certain sense, owe to all such persons a *service*, which is yet freedom, to help them in obtaining the salvation which is in Christ. I added the epithet *Dilectissimus* [most beloved]; and as I now call him by this term, so shall I continue to do so, even if he be angry with me; because, if I ceased to retain my love towards him, because of his feeling the anger, I should only injure myself rather than him. I, moreover, styled him *Desideratissimus* [most longed-for], because I greatly longed to have a conversation with him in person; for I had already heard that

¹ [This term corresponds somewhat to our *Sir*; but Augustine here refers to its more expressive meaning of *Master*, or *Lord*.]

he was endeavouring publicly to oppose the [doctrine of] grace, whereby we are justified, whenever any mention was made of it. The brief contents of the letter itself indeed show all this; for, after thanking him for the pleasure he gave me by the information of his own health and that of his friends (whose bodily health we are bound of course to wish for, however much we may desire their amendment in other respects), I at once expressed the hope that the Lord would recompense him with such blessings as do not appertain to physical welfare, but which he used to think, and probably still thinks, consist solely in the freedom and power he possesses over his will,—at the same time, and for this reason, wishing him eternal life. Then again, remembering the many good and kind wishes he had expressed for me in his letter, which I was answering, I went on to beg of him, too, that he would pray for me, that the Lord would indeed make me such a man as he believed me to be already; that so I might gently remind him, against the opinion he was himself entertaining, that the very righteousness which he had thought worthy to be praised in me was “not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy.”¹ This is the substance of that short letter of mine, and such was my purpose when I dictated it. This is a copy of it:

CHAP. 52. [XXVII. AND XXVIII.]

“To my very dear sir, and most longed-for brother Pelagius, Augustine sends greeting in the Lord. I thank you very much for the pleasure you have kindly afforded me by your letter, and for informing me of your good health. May the Lord requite you with blessings, and may you ever enjoy them, and live with Him for evermore in eternity, my very dear sir and most longed-for brother. For my own part, indeed, although I do not admit your high encomiums of me, which your kind letter² conveys, I yet cannot be insensible of the benevolent view you entertain towards my poor deserts; at the same time requesting you to pray for me, that the Lord would make me

¹ Rom. ix. 16.

² [*Tuæ Benignitatis Epistola* is more than “your kind letter.” “*Benignitas*” is a complimentary abstract title addressed to the correspondent.]

such a man as you suppose me to be already." Then, in another hand, it follows: "Be mindful of us; may you be safe, and find favour with the Lord, my very dear sir and most beloved brother."

CHAP. 53. [XXIX.]

As to that which I placed in the postscript,—that he might "find favour with the Lord,"—I intimated that this lay rather in His grace than in man's sole will; for I did not make it the subject either of exhortation, or of precept, or of instruction, but simply of my wish. But just in the same way as I should, if I had fallen to exhorting or enjoining, or even to instructing him, simply have shown that all this appertained indeed to the freedom of man's will, without, however, derogating from the grace of God; so, in like manner, when I expressed the matter in the way of a wish, I asserted no doubt the grace of God, but at the same time I did not quench the liberty of the human will. Wherefore, then, did he produce this letter at the trial? If he had only from the beginning entertained views in accordance with it, very likely he would not have been at all summoned before the bishops by the brethren, who, with all their kindness of disposition, could yet not help being offended with his perverse contentiousness. Now, however, as I have given on my part an account of this letter of mine, so would they, whose epistles he quoted, explain theirs also, if it were necessary;—they would tell us either what they thought, or what they were ignorant of, or with what purpose they wrote to him. Pelagius, therefore, may boast to his heart's content of the friendship of holy men, he may read their letters recounting his praises, he may produce whatever synodal acts he pleases to attest his own acquittal,—there still stands against him the fact, proved by the testimony of competent witnesses, that he has inserted in his books statements which are opposed to that grace of God whereby we are called and justified; and unless he shall, after true confession, anathematize these statements, and then go on to contradict them both in his writings and discussions, he will certainly seem to all those who have a fuller knowledge of him to have laboured in vain in his attempt to set himself right.

CHAP. 54. [XXX.]—*On the letter of Pelagius, in which he boasts that his errors had been approved by fourteen Bishops.*

For I will no longer conceal my opinion of the transactions which took place after this trial, and which rather augment the suspicion against him. A certain epistle found its way into our hands, which was ascribed to Pelagius himself, writing to a friend of his, a presbyter, who had kindly admonished him (as appears from the forenamed epistle), to prevent any one's separating himself from the body of the Church on his account. Among the other contents of this document, which it would be both tedious and unnecessary to quote here, Pelagius says: "By the sentence of fourteen bishops our statement was received with approbation, in which we affirmed that 'a man is able to live without sin, and easily to keep the commandments of God, if he pleases.' This sentence [of the bishops]," says he, "has filled the mouths of the gainsayers with confusion, and has separated asunder the entire set which was conspiring together for evil." Whether, indeed, this epistle was really written by Pelagius, or was composed by somebody in his name, none can fail to discern, after the manner in which the erroneous doctrine claims to have achieved a victory, even in the judicial proceedings where it was refuted and condemned. Now, he has adduced the words we have just quoted according to the form in which they occur in his book of *Capitula* ["Chapters"], as it is called, not in the shape in which they were objected to him at his trial, and even repeated by him in his answer. For even his accusers, through some unaccountable inaccuracy, left out a word in their indictment, concerning which there is no small controversy. They made him say, that "a man is able to live without sin, if he likes; and, if he likes, to keep the commandments of God." There is nothing said here about this being "*easily*" done. Afterwards, when he gave his answer, he spake thus: "We said, that a man is able to live without sin, and to keep the commandments of God, if he pleases;" he did not then say, "*easily* keep," but only "keep." So in another passage, amongst the statements about which Hilary consulted me, and I gave him my views, it was objected to Pelagius that he had said, "A man is able, if he likes, to live without sin;" when he admitted

himself, in reply, that he had already said, "A man is able to live without sin." Now, on this occasion, we do not find on the part either of those who brought the objection or of him who rebutted it, that the word "*easily*" was used at all. Then, again, in the narrative of the holy Bishop John, which we have partly quoted above,¹ he says, "When they were importunate and exclaimed, 'He is a heretic;' he said, 'Still it is true that a man is able, if he only will, to live without sin;' and then, when we questioned him on this point, he answered, 'I did not say that man's nature has received the power of being impeccable,—but I said, whosoever is willing, in the pursuit of his own salvation, to labour and struggle to abstain from sinning, and to walk in the commandments of God, receives the possibility of doing so from God;' then, whilst some were whispering, and remarking on the statement of Pelagius, that 'without God's grace man was able to attain perfection,' I then censured the statement" [continued the bishop], "and reminded them, besides, that even the Apostle Paul, after so many labours,—not, indeed, in his own strength, but by the grace of God,—said, 'I laboured more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God that was with me,'² and so on, as I have already mentioned."

CHAP. 55.

What, then, is the meaning of those vaunting words of theirs in this epistle, wherein they boast of having induced the fourteen bishops who sat in that trial to believe not merely that a man is able, but that He is "*easily*" able to abstain from sinning, according to the position which is laid down in the *Capitula* of this same Pelagius,—when, in the draft of the proceedings, notwithstanding the frequent repetition of the general charge and full consideration bestowed on it, there is nowhere found the occurrence of this [offensive word]? How, indeed, can this word fail to contradict the very defence and answer which Pelagius made; since the Bishop John asserted that Pelagius put in this answer in his presence, that "he wished it to be understood that the man who willingly laboured and strove to secure his salvation was able to avoid

¹ In. 37. [xiv.]² 1 Cor. xv. 10.

sin," while Pelagius himself, when engaged in a formal inquiry and conducting his defence,¹ distinctly said, that "it was by his own effort and the grace of God that a man is able to live without sin?" Now, is a thing *easily* done when labour and effort are required to effect it? For I suppose that every man would agree with us in the opinion, that wherever there is effort there cannot be an *easy* achievement of a result. And yet this precious epistle, buoyed up by the lightness of its inflated and turgid contents, has outrun in speed the record of the proceedings, which was drawn more tardily, and has first fallen into men's hands; so it is asserted that fourteen bishops in the East have determined, not only "that a man is able to live without sin, and to keep God's commandments," but "*easily* able." Nor is God's assistance once named: it is merely said, "If he likes;" so that, of course, as nothing is affirmed of the divine grace, for which the earnest fight was made, it remains that the only thing one reads of in this epistle is the unhappy and self-deceiving—because represented as victorious—power of human pride. As if the Bishop John, indeed, had not expressly declared that he censured this statement, and that, by the help of three inspired texts of Scripture,² he had, as if by thunderbolts, struck to the ground the gigantic mountains of such presumption which they had piled up against the still over-towering heights of heavenly grace; or as if again those other bishops who were John's assessors could have borne with Pelagius, either in mind or even in ear, when he pronounced these words: "We said that a man is able to live without sin and to keep the commandments of God, if he likes," unless he had gone on at once to say: "But the ability to do this God has given to him" (for they were quite unaware that he was speaking of nature, and not of that grace which they had learnt from the doctrine of the apostle); and had afterwards added this qualification: "We never said, however, that any man could be found, who at no time whatever from his infancy to his old age committed sin, but that

¹ [At the Synod of Diospolis. The proceedings before John, bishop of Jerusalem, were not duly registered. See above, 39.]

² [See above, 37.]

if any person were converted from his sins, he could by his own exertion and the grace of God live without sin." Now, by the very fact that in their sentence they used these words, he has answered correctly, "that a man can live without sin when he has the assistance and grace of God;" what else did they fear than that, if he denied this, he would be doing a manifest wrong not to man's inability, but to God's grace? It has indeed not been defined at what particular time a man becomes sinless; it has only been judicially settled, that this result can only be reached by the assisting grace of God; it has not, I say, been defined whether a man, whilst he is in this flesh which lusts against the Spirit, ever has been, or now is, or ever can be, by his present use of reason and free-will, either in the full society of man or in monastic solitude, in such a state as to be beyond the necessity of offering up the prayer, not in behalf of others, but for himself personally: "Forgive us our debts;"¹ or whether this gift [of a sinless condition] shall be consummated at the time when "we shall be like Him, when we shall see Him as He is;"² when it shall be said, not by [Christians] militant: "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind,"³ but by them when triumphant: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"⁴ Now, this is perhaps hardly a question which ought to be discussed between Catholics and heretics, but only among Catholics with a view to a peaceful settlement.⁵

CHAP. 56. [XXXI.]

How, then, can it be believed that Pelagius (if indeed this epistle is his) could have been sincere, when he acknowledged the grace of God, which is not nature with its free-will, nor the knowledge of the law, nor simply the forgiveness of sins, but a something which is necessary to each of our actions, and when he anathematized everybody who entertained the contrary opinion,—seeing that in his epistle he set forth the

¹ Matt. vi. 12.² 1 John iii. 2.³ Rom. vii. 23.⁴ 1 Cor xv. 55.⁵ [This point, however, was definitely settled a year or two afterwards, at a council held in Carthage. (See its Canons 6-8.) See also, above, the Preface to the treatise *On the Perfection of Man's Righteousness.*]

ease wherewith a man could avoid sinning (concerning which no question had arisen at this trial), just as if the judges had come to an agreement to receive even this word, and said nothing about the grace of God, by the acknowledgment and subsequent admission of which [at the trial] he escaped the penalty of condemnation by the Church?

CHAP. 57. [XXXII.]—*Fraudulent practices pursued by Pelagius in his report of the proceedings in Palestine, in the paper wherein he defended himself to Augustine.*

There is yet another point which I must not pass over in silence. In a paper containing his defence which he sent to me by a friend of ours, one Charus, a citizen of Hippo, but a deacon in the Eastern Church, he has made a statement which is different from what is contained in the Acts of the Bishops. Now, these formal acts, as regards their contents, are of a far higher and firmer tone, and altogether more straightforward in defending the Catholic verity in opposition to this heretical pestilence. Now, when I read this paper of his, previous to receiving a copy of the Acts, I was not aware that he had put down therein those very words which he had used at the trial, when he was present for himself. There are a few in respect of which there is not much discrepancy, and which do not occasion me much anxiety. [XXXIII.] But I could not help feeling annoyance at the unmistakeable signs he gave of having kept back a defence of sundry sentences of Coelestius, which he had clearly enough anathematized in the Acts. Now, some of these he disavowed for himself, simply remarking, that "he was not in any way responsible for them." In his paper, however, he refused to anathematize these same opinions, which are to this effect: "That Adam was created mortal, and that he must have died whether he had sinned or not. That Adam's sin injured only himself, and not the human race. That the law, no less than the gospel, leads us to the kingdom [of heaven]. That new-born infants are in the same condition as Adam was before he fell. That, on the one hand, the entire human race does not die owing to Adam's death and transgression; nor, on the other hand, does the whole human race rise again through

the resurrection of Christ. That infants, even if they die unbaptized, have eternal life. That rich men, even if they are baptized, unless they renounce and give up all, have, whatever good they may seem to have done, nothing of it reckoned to them; neither shall they possess the kingdom of heaven. Now, in his paper, the answer which he gives to all this is: "These statements have not been all made by me, even on their own showing, nor do I hold myself responsible for them." In the Acts of the Bishops, however, he expressed himself as follows on these points: "The other points were never advanced by me, as even *their* testimony goes to show, to whom, however, I do not feel that I am at all answerable for them. But yet, for the satisfaction of the holy synod, I anathematize those who either now hold, or have ever held, these opinions." Now, why did he not express himself thus in his paper also? It would not, I suppose, have cost much ink, or writing, or delay; nor have occupied much of the paper itself, if he had done this. Who, however, can help believing that there is a contrivance in all this, for the purpose of passing off this paper in all directions as an abridgment of the Episcopal Acts? In consequence of which, men might think that there had arisen an interference with his right still to maintain any of these opinions which he pleased,—on the ground that they had been simply laid to his charge, but had not received his approbation, although, at the same time, they had not been by him anathematized and condemned.

CHAP. 58.

He has, moreover, in this same paper, huddled together many of the points which were objected against him out of the *Capitula*, or heads, of Cœlestius' book; nor has he kept distinct, at the intervals which separate them in the Acts, the two answers in which he anathematized these very heads [before the bishops;] but he has substituted one general reply for them all. This, I should have supposed, had been done for the sake of brevity, had I not perceived that he had a very special object in the arrangement which disturbs us. For thus has he closed this answer: "I say again, that these opinions, even according to their own showing, are not mine;

nor, as I have already said, am I to be held responsible for them. The opinions which I have confessed to be my own, I maintain are sound and correct; those, however, which I have said are not my own, I reject according to the judgment of this holy synod, pronouncing anathema on every man that opposes and gainsays the doctrines of the holy Catholic Church; and likewise on those who by broaching false opinions have excited odium against us." This last paragraph the Acts do not contain; it has, however, no bearing on the matter which causes us anxiety. By all means let them have his anathema who have brought him into disrepute by their invention of false doctrine. But, when first I read, "Those opinions which I have said are not my own, I reject in accordance with the judgment of this holy synod," being ignorant that any judgment had been arrived at on the point by the Church, since there is here nothing said about it (and I had not then read the Acts, or formal proceedings before the bishops), I really thought that nothing else was meant than that he promised that he would entertain the same view about the *Capitula* of Cœlestius as the Church, which had not yet determined the question, might some day decide respecting them; and that he was ready to reject the opinions which the Church had not yet indeed rejected, but might one day have occasion to reject; and that this, too, was the purport of what he further said: "Pronouncing anathema on every man that opposes and gainsays the doctrines of the holy Catholic Church." But in fact, as the Acts testify, a judgment of the Church had already been pronounced on these subjects by the fourteen bishops; and it was in accordance with this judgment that he professed to reject all these opinions, and to pronounce his anathema against those persons who, by reason of the said opinions, were contravening the judgment, which had already, as the proceedings show, been actually settled. For already had the judges asked: "What says the monk Pelagius to all these heads of opinion which have been read in his presence? For this holy synod condemns them, as does also God's holy Catholic Church." Now, they who know nothing of all this, and only read this paper of his, are led to suppose that some one or other of these opinions may lawfully be maintained,

as if they had not been determined to be contrary to Catholic doctrine, and as if Pelagius had declared himself to be ready to hold the same sentiments concerning them as the Church, which had not as yet determined, but might have to determine. He has not, in short, expressed himself in this paper, to which we have so often referred, straightforwardly enough for us to discover the fact, of which we find a voucher in the Acts, that all those dogmatic assertions which were being stealthily overrun by this same heresy, and were in turn inspiring it with the vigour of a contentious audacity, had really been condemned by fourteen bishops presiding in an ecclesiastical synod. Now, if he was afraid that this fact would become known, as is the case, he has more reason for self-correction than for resentment at the vigilance with which we are watching the controversy to the best of our ability, however late. If, however, it is untrue that he had any such fears, and we are only indulging in a suspicion which is natural to man, let him forgive us; but, at the same time, let him continue to oppose and resist the opinions which were rejected by him with anathemas in the proceedings before the bishops, when he was on his defence; for if he now shows any leniency to them, he would run the risk of seeming not only to have believed these opinions formerly, but to be cherishing them still.

CHAP. 59. [XXXIV.]—*Although Pelagius was acquitted, his heresy was condemned.*

Now, with respect to this treatise of mine, which perhaps is not unreasonably lengthy, considering the importance and extent of its subject, I have wished to inscribe it to your Reverence, in order that, if it be not displeasing to your mind, it may become known to such persons as I have thought to stand in need of it under the recommendation of your authority, which carries so much more weight than our own poor industry. [With such a sanction, I trust that my endeavour will avail] to crush the vain and contentious thoughts of those persons who suppose that, because Pelagius was acquitted, those Eastern bishops who pronounced the judgment approved of those dogmas which are beginning to shed very pernicious influences against the Christian faith, and that

grace of God whereby we are called and justified. These the Christian verity never ceases to condemn, as indeed it condemned them even by the authoritative sentence of the fourteen bishops; nor would it, on the occasion in question, have hesitated to condemn Pelagius too, unless he had anathematized the heretical opinions with which he was charged. But now, while we render to this man the respect of brotherly affection (and we have all along expressed with all sincerity our anxiety for him and interest in him), let us observe, with as much brevity as is consistent with accuracy of observation, that, notwithstanding the undoubted fact of his having been acquitted by a human verdict, the heresy itself has ever been held worthy of condemnation by divine judgment, and has actually been condemned by the sentence of these fourteen bishops of the Eastern Church.

CHAP. 60. [XXXV.]

This is the concluding clause of their judgment. The synod said: "Now forasmuch as we have received satisfaction in these inquiries from the monk Pelagius, who has been present; since he yields assent to godly doctrines, and rejects and anathematizes those which are repugnant to the faith of the Church, we pronounce him still to belong to the communion of the Catholic Church." Now, there are two facts here contained with entire perspicuity in this brief statement of the holy bishops who judged him, concerning the monk Pelagius: one, that "he yields assent to godly doctrines;" the other, that "he rejects and anathematizes those which are repugnant to the faith of the Church." On account of these two concessions, Pelagius was pronounced to be "in the communion of the Catholic Church." Let us, in pursuit of our inquiry, briefly recapitulate the entire facts, in order to discover what were the words he used which made those two points so clear, as far as men were able at the moment to form a judgment as to what were manifest points. In regard, indeed, to the allegations which were made against him, he is said to have rejected and anathematized, as contrary [to the faith of the Church,] all the statements which in his answer he denied having ever made. Let us, then, summarize the whole case so far as we can.

CHAP. 61.—*The Pelagian heresy was raised by sundry persons who affected the monastic state.*

Since the Apostle Paul's prediction must needs be accomplished,—“There must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you,”¹—after the promulgation of the older heresies, there has been lately introduced, not by bishops or presbyters, or indeed by any persons of the clerical orders, but by certain men who have affected the monastic life, a heresy which disputatiously resists, under colour of defending our free will, that grace of God which we have through our Lord Jesus Christ, and endeavours to overthrow the foundation of the Christian faith, of which it is written, “Since by one man came death, by one man came also the resurrection of the dead; for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive;”² and thoroughly denies God's help in our actions, by affirming that, “in order to avoid sin and to fulfil righteousness, human nature has sufficient power, which has been created with a free will; and that God's grace lies in the fact that we have been so created as to be able [to accomplish so much] by the exercise of our free will; and in the further fact that God has given to us the assistance of His law and commandments, and also in that He forgives their past sins when men turn to Him.” In these things alone must God's grace be regarded as consisting, not in the help He gives us for each of our actions; “seeing that a man can live without sin, and keep God's commandments easily if he likes.”

CHAP. 62.—*Cœlestius condemned at Carthage by episcopal judgment. Pelagius acquitted by bishops in Palestine, in consequence of his deceptive answers; but yet his heresy was condemned by them.*

After this heresy had deceived a great many persons, and was still disturbing the brethren whom it had failed to deceive, one Cœlestius, who entertained these sentiments, was brought up for trial before the Church of Carthage, and was condemned by a formal sentence of the bishops there present.³

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 19.

² 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22.

³ This trial was held at Carthage, before the Bishop Aurelius (to whom Augustine dedicated the present treatise), at the beginning of the year 402, as appears from the letter to Innocentius among Augustine's *Epistles*, 175.

A few years afterwards, Pelagius himself, who was said to have been this man's instructor, having been accused of holding his heresy, found his way also before an episcopal tribunal.¹ The indictment was prepared against him by the Gallican bishops, Heros and Lazarus, who were, however, not present at the proceedings, being excused from attendance owing to the illness of one of them. After the charges were duly recited, and Pelagius had met them by his answers, the fourteen bishops of the province of Palestine were induced by the tenor of his vindication to pronounce him free from the taint of this heresy, although they did not hesitate, at the same time, to condemn the heresy itself. They approved indeed of his answer to one of the objections, that "a man is assisted by a knowledge of the law, towards not sinning; even as it is written, 'He hath given them a law for a help;'"² but yet they disapproved of this knowledge of the law being regarded as that grace of God concerning which the Scripture says: "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord."³ Nor did Pelagius say absolutely: "All men are ruled by their own will," as if God did not rule them; for he said, when questioned on this point: "This I stated in the interest of the freedom of our will; God is its helper, whenever it makes choice of God. Man, however, when sinning, is himself in fault, as being under the direction of his free will." They approved, moreover, of his statement, that "in the day of judgment no leniency will be shown to the ungodly and the sinners, but they will be punished in everlasting fires;" because in his defence he said, "that he had made such an assertion in accordance with the gospel, in which it is written concerning sinners, 'They shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.'"⁴ It must be observed here, that he had not said, *all* sinners are reserved for eternal punishment, for then he would evidently have run counter to the apostle, who distinctly states that some of them will be saved, "yet so as by fire."⁵ When also Pelagius said

¹ This happened in the year 415, in the month of December, at Diospolis.

² Isa. viii. 20 (Septuagint).

³ Rom. vii. 24, 25.

⁴ Matt. xxv. 46.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii. 15.

that "the kingdom of heaven was promised even in the Old Testament," they approved of the statement, on the ground that he supported himself by the testimony of the prophet Daniel, who thus wrote: "The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom."¹ They understood him in this statement of his to mean by the term "Old Testament," not simply the covenant which was made on Mount Sinai, but the entire body of the canonical Scriptures which had been given previous to the coming of the Lord. His allegation, however, that "a man is able to live without sin, if he likes," was not approved by the bishops in the sense which he had evidently meant it to bear in his book—as implying that this attainment of sinlessness was solely in a man's power by reason of his free-will (for it was contended that he must have meant no less than this by his saying: "if he likes"),—but only in the sense which he actually gave to the passage on the present occasion in his answer; in the very sense, indeed, in which the episcopal judges mentioned the subject in their own interlocution with especial brevity and clearness, that a man is able to live without sin with the help and grace of God. But still it was left undetermined when the saints were to attain to this state of perfection,—whether in the body of this death, or when death shall be swallowed up in victory.

CHAP. 63.—*The dogmas of Cœlestius were laid to the charge of Pelagius, as his master.*

Of the opinions which were objected against Pelagius, on the ground that they had been dogmatically affirmed, by oral teaching or in writing, by his disciple Cœlestius, he acknowledged some as entertained also by himself; but, in his vindication, he said that he held them in a different sense from that which was alleged in the indictment. One of these opinions was thus stated: "Before the advent of Christ some men lived holy and righteous lives." Cœlestius, however, was stated to have said that "they lived *sinless* lives." Again, it was objected that Cœlestius declared "the Church to be without spot and wrinkle." Pelagius, however, said in his reply, "that he had made such an assertion, but as meaning that the Church is by the laver of baptism cleansed from every spot

¹ Dan. vii. 18.

and wrinkle, and that in this purity the Lord would have her continue." Respecting that statement of Cœlestius: "That we do more than is commanded us in the law and the gospel," Pelagius urged in his own vindication, that "he spoke concerning that virginity" of which Paul says: "I have no commandment of the Lord."¹ Another objection alleged, that Cœlestius had maintained that "every individual has the faculty of possessing all powers and graces, thus annulling that 'diversity of gifts' which the apostle sets forth." Pelagius, however, answered, that "he did not annul the diversity of gifts, but declared that God gives to the man who has proved himself worthy to receive them, all graces, even as He conferred them on the Apostle Paul."

CHAP. 64.

These four dogmas, thus connected with the name of Cœlestius, were therefore not approved by the bishops in their judgment, in the sense in which Cœlestius was said to have set them forth, but in the sense which Pelagius gave to them in his reply. For they saw clearly enough, that it is one thing to lead a sinless life, and another thing to live holily and righteously, as Scripture testifies that some lived before the coming of Christ. And although the Church here on earth is not without spot or wrinkle, she is yet being cleansed from every spot and wrinkle by the laver of regeneration, and in this state the Lord would have her continue. And continue she certainly will, for without doubt she shall reign without spot or wrinkle in an everlasting felicity. [They saw, too,] that the perpetual virginity, which is not commanded, is unquestionably a greater thing than the purity of wedded life, which is commanded—although virginity is perpetuated in many persons, who, notwithstanding, are not without sin. [And they, moreover, saw] that all those graces were in fact possessed by the Apostle Paul, which he enumerates in a certain passage; and yet, for all that, they could quite understand, in regard to his having been worthy to receive them, either that the merit was not according to his works, but rather, in some [mysterious] way, according to [God's] predestination; (for the apostle says himself: "I am not [worthy, or] meet to be called an apostle;")² or else their attention was not arrested by

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 25.² 1 Cor. xv. 9.

the sense which Pelagius gave to the word, as he himself viewed it. Such are the points on which the bishops pronounced the agreement of Pelagius with the doctrines of godly truth.

CHAP. 65.

Let us now, by a like recapitulation, bestow a little more attention on those subjects which the bishops said he rejected and condemned as contrary to the faith; for herein especially lies the gist of the whole of that heresy. We will entirely pass over the strange terms of adulation which he is reported to have put into writing in praise of a certain widow; these expressions he denied having ever inserted in any of his writings, or given utterance to, at any time whatever, while he anathematised all who held the opinions in question not indeed as heretics, but as simpletons. The following are the wild thickets of this heresy, which we are sorry to see shooting out buds, nay growing into trees, day by day:—"That Adam was made mortal, and must have died whether he had sinned or not; that Adam's sin injured only himself, and not the human race; that the law no less than the gospel leads us to the kingdom [of heaven]; that new-born infants are in the same condition as Adam was before he fell; that the whole human race does not, on the one hand, die in consequence of Adam's death and transgression; nor, on the other hand, does the whole human race rise again through the resurrection of Christ; that infants, even if they die unbaptized, have eternal life; that rich men, even if baptized, unless they renounce and surrender everything, have (whatever good they may seem to have done) nothing of it reckoned to them; neither can they possess the kingdom of God; that God's grace and assistance are not given for single actions, but are imparted in the freedom of the will, and in the law and in doctrine; that the grace of God is bestowed according to our merits, so that grace really lies at the control of a man's own will, as he makes himself worthy or unworthy of it; that men cannot be called children of God, unless they have become entirely free from sin; that oblivion and ignorance are no underlying elements of sin, as they do not happen through the will, but occur of necessity; that the will cannot be free, if it requires the help of God; inasmuch as every one in the pos-

session of his proper will has either something to do, or to abstain from doing; that our victory comes not from God's help, but from our own free will; that from the circumstance of [the Apostle] Peter's saying, that 'we are partakers of the divine nature,'¹ it must follow that the soul has the power of being without sin, just in the way that God Himself has." For no less than this have I read in the eleventh chapter of the book, which bears no title of its author, but is commonly reported to be the work of Cœlestius,—in words to this effect: "Now how can anybody," asks the author, "become a *partaker* of the thing from the condition and power of which he is distinctly declared to be a stranger?" Accordingly, the brethren who prepared these objections understood him to have said that man's soul and God are of the self-same nature, and to have asserted that the soul is a portion of God; for they took him to mean that the soul partakes of the same condition and power as God. Moreover, in the last of the objections laid to his charge there occurs this position: "That pardon is not given to penitents according to the grace and mercy of God, but according to their own merits and effort, since through repentance they have been worthy of mercy." Now all these dogmas, and the arguments which were advanced in support of them, were repudiated and anathematised by Pelagius, and his conduct herein was approved of by the judges, who accordingly pronounced that he had, by his rejection and anathema, condemned the opinions in question as contrary to the faith. Let us therefore rejoice—whatever may be the circumstances of the case, whether Cœlestius laid down these theses or not, or whether Pelagius believed them or not—that the injurious principles of this new heresy were condemned before that ecclesiastical tribunal; and let us thank God for such a result, and proclaim His praises.

CHAP. 66.—*The harsh measures of the Pelagians against the holy monks and nuns who belonged to Jerome's charge.*

There is another point [connected with this narrative] which concerns the conduct of sundry followers of Pelagius who carried their support of his cause after these judicial proceedings to an incredible extent of perverseness and audacity. They

¹ 2 Pet. i. 4.

are said¹ to have most cruelly beaten and maltreated the servants and handmaidens of the Lord who lived under the care of the holy presbyter Jerome, slain his deacon, and burnt his monastic houses ; whilst he himself, by God's mercy, narrowly escaped the violent attacks of these impious assailants in the shelter of a well-defended fortress. However, I think it better becomes me to say nothing of these matters, but to wait and see what measures our brethren the bishops may deem it their duty to adopt concerning such scandalous enormities ; for nobody can suppose that it is possible for them to pass them over without notice. Impious *doctrines* put forth by persons of this character it is no doubt the duty of all Catholics, however remote their residence, to oppose and refute, and so to hinder all injury from such opinions wheresoever they may happen to find their way ; but impious *actions* it belongs to the discipline of the episcopal authority on the spot to control ; and they must be left for punishment to the bishops of the very place or immediate neighbourhood, to be dealt with as pastoral diligence and godly severity may suggest. We, therefore, who live at so great a distance, are bound to hope that such a stop may there be put to proceedings of this kind, that there may be no necessity elsewhere of further invoking judicial remedies. But what rather befits our personal activity is so to set forth the truth, that the minds of all those who have been severely wounded by the report, so widely spread everywhere, may be healed by the mercy of God following our efforts. With this desire, I must now at last terminate this work, which, should it succeed, as I hope, in commending itself to your mind, will I trust, with the Lord's blessing, become serviceable to its readers—recommended to them, [Aurelius], rather by your name than by my own, and through your care and diligence receiving a far wider circulation.

¹ [He here refers to a letter (32) of Pope Innocent to John, Bishop of Jerusalem. It thus commences : "Plunder, slaughter, incendiary fire, every atrocity of the maddest kind have been deplored by the noble and holy virgins Eustochium and Paula, as having been perpetrated, at the devil's instigation, in several places of your diocese," etc. An epistle by the same writer (33) addressed to Jerome, begins with these words : "The apostle testifies that contention never did any good to the Church."]

845101



BR 65 .A5 E5 1872
v.4 SMC
AUGUSTINE, SAINT, BISHOP
OF HIPPO.
THE WORKS OF AURELIUS
AUGUSTINE, BISHOP OF
AMY-9660 (MCAB)



